

3534. Also, petition of Kansas State Bankers' Association, Topeka, Kans., protesting against branch banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3535. Also, petition of E. F. Blaine, Seattle, Wash., protesting against the change of the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3536. Also, petition of G. H. Justice, Macdoel, Calif., indorsing the public shooting ground bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3537. Also, petition of Harry L. Walker, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing Shreve bill (H. R. 8352); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3538. Also, petition of the National Legislative Committee, American Legion, Washington, D. C., relative to House bill 9629, for the reorganization of the Government departments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3539. Also, petition of National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing House bill 849, providing for an annuity for employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3540. Also, petition of Harvey M. Toy, chairman California Highway Commission, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing and urging passage of the Colton bill (H. R. 6133); to the Committee on Roads.

3541. Also, petition of Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis., indorsing the Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3542. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of residents of Corvallis, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3543. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Marion and Benton Counties, Oreg., protesting against passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3544. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Willamina, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3545. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Tillamook, Oreg., against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3546. Also, petition of Clara Dillon and others, of Boardman, Morrow County, Oreg., against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3547. Also, petition of 75 residents of Hereford and Long Creek, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3548. By Mr. SMITH: Petition of the Loyal Orange Institution of the United States, Boise Loyal Orange Lodge, No. 360, urging ample appropriations for maintaining and improving the air forces to combat those of any other country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3549. By Mr. WATKINS: Petition of City Council of Portland, Oreg., urging Congress to provide funds to build a hospital on a site offered by the medical school of the University of Oregon for veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3550. Also, petition of citizens of Portland, Oreg., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 24, 1925

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 22, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11749) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1656. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the La Plata River compact;

S. 3036. An act to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin;

S. 3792. An act to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code; and

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to grant a right of way over United States Veterans' Bureau hospital reservation at Knoxville, Iowa.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. OVERMAN presented the certificate of the Governor of the State of North Carolina certifying to the election of FURNIFOLD M. SIMMONS as a Senator from the State for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1925, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1924, FURNIFOLD M. SIMMONS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th of March, 1925.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Angus Wilton McLean, and our seal affixed at Raleigh, N. C., this 22d day of January, in the year of our Lord 1925.

ANGUS W. McLEAN, Governor.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

W. N. EVERETT, Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BAYARD. I ask unanimous consent to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the Record resolutions adopted by the Council of the Mayor and the Council of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 22, 1925.

Whereas we believe the United States should clearly make up its mind whether it desires to participate in the World Court, and thus join the other great nations of the world in an attempt to substitute law and the principle of arbitration for war as a method for settling international disputes: Be it

Resolved, That the Council of the Mayor and Council of Wilmington urges the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States, by whatever procedure is found to be best, to get before the full Senate for a vote a resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the World Court on the Harding-Hughes terms. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our two Senators, Congressman, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BROOKHART presented the petition and complaint of the Arthur Arent Laboratories (Inc.), of Des Moines, Iowa, in the matter of certain charges against George M. Hunt, acting director Forest Products Laboratory and in charge of section of wood preservation, Forest Products Laboratory, and Ernest Bateman, chemist, Forest Products Laboratory, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Fort Dodge, Iowa, signed by Mrs. Frank O. Peterson, praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a World Court mass meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BINGHAM presented the petition of John Hay Lodge No. 61, Knights of Pythias, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation for the relief of immigrants stranded

in Europe because of inability to obtain passports, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the general board of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste D'Amerique, at Goodyear, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation for the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's and Civic Association, of Wethersfield, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation increasing the rates on parcel post matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented resolutions of Harry W. Congdon Post No. 11, American Legion, and John J. Banville Post No. 3, American Disabled Veterans of the World War, both of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the abandonment of the Veterans' Bureau headquarters in Bridgeport, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of the Real Estate Boards of Stamford, Meriden, and New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of legislation creating a permanent commission for the control of rentals in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STANFIELD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hereford, Long Creek, Morrow County, Portland, Multnomah, Reedsport, Boardman, St. Helens, Hillsboro, Canby, Hood River, Bend, Estacada, Forest Grove, Gaston, Toledo, and Newport, all in the State of Oregon, and of sundry citizens of Tampa, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9138) to authorize the discontinuance of the seven-year regauge of distilled spirits in bonded warehouses, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 920) thereon.

Mr. BRUCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2958) for the relief of Isaac J. Reese, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 921) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1534) authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of major, Coast Artillery Corps, in the United States Army, submitted an adverse report thereon.

Mr. REED of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3793) to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 922) thereon.

Mr. HARRELD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9343) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 923) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3017) to establish a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 925) thereon.

Mr. BURSUM, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 3314) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian War veterans and widows, and to certain Spanish war soldiers and widows, and certain maimed soldiers, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 926) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11354) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 927) thereon.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF POWER COMPANIES

Mr. SMITH, Mr. President, I have been instructed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce to ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] if he would be willing to consent to an extension of time, not to exceed five days, for a report on the

resolution (S. Res. 286) submitted by him December 29, 1924. It may be possible for us to get through in less time, but we would like to have five days additional.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course the time will have to be extended by the Senate, but so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended not to exceed five days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4057) providing for the irrigation of certain lands in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4058) for the relief of Leandert J. DeBeer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4059) to provide for an additional Federal district for North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4060) to recognize and reward the accomplishment of First Lieut. Russell L. Maughan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 4061) granting an increase of pension to Lilly D. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4062) for the relief of Henry Kirn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 4063) granting a pension to Ida B. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4064) granting a pension to Rosario M. Madrid;

A bill (S. 4065) granting an increase of pension to Francesca Napoleone; and

A bill (S. 4066) granting an increase of pension to Gus M. Brass, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4067) granting a pension to George Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 4068) authorizing the Citizen Band of Pottawatomie Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4069) relative to the acquirement of the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 174) authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1925, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. BROUSSARD and Mr. FLETCHER each submitted an amendment, and Mr. SWANSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

Mr. GEORGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JAMES L. PYNE, DECEASED

On motion of Mr. NEELY, it was—

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 3190) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Pyne, deceased, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PREVENTION OF WAR PROFITTEERING

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it may be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution, S. Res. 312, as follows:

Whereas in all wars illegitimate private profits are derived from dealings with the Government, which become the main cause of high prices in various lines of industrial activity, and afford an incentive for private interests to promote war; and

Whereas in time of war there should be no private profits and the resources of all should be mobilized on equal and just terms for the prosecution of the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate approves in principle of the proposition that in the event of war it shall be the policy of the Government to draft not only its man power but its material and industrial resources, in order to prevent profiteering and the amassing of private fortunes out of the prosecution of the war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there may be some doubt as to the committee which should have jurisdiction of this resolution and the subject with which it deals. It has been suggested to me that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs, but I have felt that with greater propriety it could be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It will be recalled that that committee framed most of the war legislation. It is true the Finance Committee reported measures providing revenue for the carrying on of the Government. However, the Judiciary Committee dealing with broad and general questions of law is best equipped, in my opinion, to consider this important subject. For that reason I have preferred the reference of the resolution to that committee.

An admirable article has been written by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch under the title "Take the profits out of war." It appears in a recent issue of *Our World*. I ask that this article be printed in the Record. Mr. Baruch, as Senators know, was one of the most efficient executives during the war and contributed in a very large way to the mobilization of the Nation's resources. As head of the War Industries Board he performed most valuable services and won the admiration and confidence not only of President Wilson but of all with whom he had to deal in that great crisis. I now ask, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary as requested, and, if there be no objection, the article to which reference is made will be printed in the Record.

The article is as follows:

TAKE THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR—A CHRISTMAS MESSAGE TO THE READERS OF OUR WORLD—HOW AMERICAN EXPERIENCE IN THE GREAT WAR SHOWS THAT WAR MOBILIZATION OF MONEY AND MATERIALS ON THE SAME BASIS AS THAT OF MEN NOT ONLY TAKES THE ILLICIT PROFIT OUT OF WAR INDUSTRIES BUT INDICATES THAT THERE IS MORE TO BE GAINED BY INDUSTRY IN PEACE

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

[Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, it will be remembered, was chairman of the War Industries Board from March, 1918, to January, 1919. He was a member of the economic section of the American Peace Commission in Paris and chairman of the raw materials division of the Supreme Economic Council, as well as economic advisor to the American Peace Commission. His endowment of the International Institute of Politics, which meets every summer now at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., is a further development of his influence for international understanding and cooperation.]

I hope America will soon join the World Court, and I believe eventually a common ground will be found by which Americans of all parties will accept the responsibility of membership in the League of Nations and will give our country a share in such far-reaching initiatives for international peace as the protocol to which 47 nations at Geneva have pledged themselves toward the outlawry of war.

But in the meantime there is an immediate domestic peace proposal we can and should enact without delay without detracting in any way whatsoever from our interest in world peace. I mean the proposal to decide now to take the profits out of the next war and to put the necessary legislation in force to make that assurance permanent. It is not a new thing in this country. We had practically accomplished the complete mobilization of money and materials, on the same basis as the draft of men, when the last war ended. That experiment convinced everyone concerned in it that on another occasion it would not only be a powerful deterrent to war to prepare to make every dollar and every unit of business serve the country as every soldier served it, but that if it had to be carried out it would be the soundest industrial and military strategy as well.

Since the war public opinion has matured slowly on this point, but last summer it had progressed so far that both major parties declared

in plain terms in their platforms for the war mobilization of money and materials on the same basis as that of men. "In the event of war," the Democratic platform declared, "in which the man power of the Nation is drafted, all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits." The Republican platform was longer, but quite as explicit. "We believe," it said, "that in time of war the Nation should draft for its defense not only its citizens but also every resource which may contribute to its success. The country demands that should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize the prices of services and essential commodities whether utilized in actual warfare or in private activity."

The only trouble with the idea of Government mobilization of capital during war is that it is so sane and obvious that people imagine there must be some catch to it. There is no catch; step by step we tried it during the late war with growing public approval and with cooperation among the great interests concerned which became more and more complete as the operation went on. The result was that the Government and the allied powers obtained copper at 23½ cents a pound when before we entered the war the prevailing spot rate was about 36 cents; it secured a 25 per cent reduction in the price of ship plates, and in other steel products, in chemicals, textiles, lumber, and other such first-line necessities which the whole Nation needed it negotiated and held drastic reductions which would otherwise have been impossible to have maintained with fair play all around.

It must be remembered that in 1917, when we entered the war, many military commodity prices were at the peak of a long period of unrestricted ascent. But as compared with the immediately preceding period American capital in the war made progressively less profit as we continued, and in a future war the full force of the draft and direction of American capital under this plan would be used to enforce the salutary lesson that less profits actually should be made in war than in peace time. They are bound to be less under such a system if only by reason of the wholesale curtailment of nonessential production which would be entailed—often highly profitable—and by the enforcement of the moral injunction now well understood and generally accepted by industry that abnormal profits are unwarrantable in a modern emergency of war.

It has been said that such a plan would lessen the initiative of American business to produce on a big scale for war needs. My only answer is that so far as it was tried it never had that effect. It certainly lessens the initiative of profiteering business to make illicit profits, but the average American business man, I became convinced when on the War Industries Board, was just as willing to submit to Government control as the average American citizen was willing to submit to the control of the military authorities in the draft. As it turned out, neither American business men nor American soldiers displayed any lack of initiative during the war. And certainly it must be admitted now that the major share of our material contribution to the war was due to the spirit of service and cooperation on the part of American industry.

What we want as the result of awakened public opinion on this subject is that Congress shall at its next session, both parties having agreed to it, place the powers in the hands of the President that will make such a decisive change in our military plans immediately and automatically possible on the outbreak of war. While I do not believe that big business ever actively desires war, this peace plan may be relied on to enlist the positive support of industry in efforts against war on occasions in the future when its outbreak becomes imminent. The gesture that America will be able to make toward the rest of the world will be that of a nation sincerely bent on stopping war by at any rate seeking to deprive its citizens of all possible profit that may derive from its operation.

The only way to prevent people from making profit after a war, supposing the war to have been alleged to be fought for markets, is to make an honest peace under the arbitrament of a league of nations. The only way to prevent people from making a profit in a war is so to control the operation of capital as to make profits eventually less than in peace time. Both of these are practical things which can and will be done, and in the more civilized world, which I believe is coming, they will not seem wonderful at all. It will be the other side of the picture that will seem wonderful, the old system of fear and stupidity which perpetuated itself for so long.

NAVAL AIR STATION AT PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I submit a brief resolution relative to a land training field at the naval air station at Pensacola, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator ask for its immediate consideration?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. It is a local matter and I think it will lead to no discussion.

Mr. KING. Should not the resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no need of referring it to a committee. It merely authorizes an investigation.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The resolution (S. Res. 313) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report on the advisability of acquiring the title in fee simple to such lands in the vicinity of Pensacola (Fla.) Naval Air Station, as he may deem desirable for use as a land training field and the estimated cost of such lands.

INCREASED FREIGHT CLASSIFICATIONS

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 314), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information respecting certain proposed increased classifications of canned fish, fruits, meats, mincemeat, and jams, jellies, and preserves, in metal cans, in barrels, boxes, or crates, as proposed by railroads in official classification territory, said proposed increases being published in Supplement No. 33, to Consolidated Freight Classification No. 3:

1. A statement showing the existing classification and the proposed increased classifications.

2. A statement showing the percentage increases which the advanced classification will mean in the freight rates applicable on these canned food products.

3. A statement as to the necessity, if any, for increases in the freight rates on these staple articles of canned goods at this time.

NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5417) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Mo., commemorative of the Battle of Westport October 23, 1864. It is a bill merely authorizing the Secretary of War to make an investigation and survey with reference to the desirability of establishing a national park to commemorate the battle. It carries no appropriation whatever, and merely authorizes the Secretary to take that action.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the bill been referred to a committee?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The bill has been before the Committee on Military Affairs and was reported unanimously.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is upon the calendar?

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is upon the calendar, Order of Business 978.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to investigate the feasibility of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo., for the purpose of commemorating the Battle of Westport, and engagements therewith connected, occurring on October 21 to October 23, 1864, both dates inclusive, and the preservation of said battle field, or so much thereof as may be suitable, for historical purposes, and to prepare plans of such park and an estimate of the cost of establishing and acquiring the same and obtain such further information as may enable Congress to act upon the matter after being fully advised.

SEC. 2. To aid and assist him in this undertaking, the Secretary of War is authorized to appoint a commission of not to exceed three persons, who shall serve without compensation or expense to the Government.

SEC. 3. That the expense of the investigation herein directed to be made shall be paid from the appropriation to the War Department from "Contingencies of the Army."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading; read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF WORLD WAR OFFICERS

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I move that the bill (S. 33) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions, officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War, be made a special order for Thursday next at 2 o'clock;

that it be then taken up for consideration and continued until finally disposed of. On the motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will state the inquiry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator's motion requires a two-thirds majority?

Mr. BURSUM. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does. The clerk will state the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico so that Senators may understand it.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from New Mexico moves that the bill (S. 33) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions, officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War, be made a special order for Thursday next at 2 o'clock, and that the bill be held before the Senate until disposed of.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KING. Assuming the propriety of moving and assuming the right of the Senator to move, under our parliamentary procedure, while a measure is before the Senate such as the postal salaries bill—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion would be in order if it did not contain the last clause read by the clerk. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion as now made is not in order.

Mr. BURSUM. I ask that the last clause be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion as thus amended is in order.

Mr. KING. I move to amend the motion by striking out the words "Thursday of next week," and inserting in lieu thereof "Monday of the following week," whatever the date may be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah moves that the word "Thursday" be stricken out and "Monday of the following week" be substituted.

Mr. SMITH. Let the motion be stated as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter is not subject to debate.

Mr. SMITH. I am not debating it. I merely want to have the motion stated as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion as amended will be stated.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from New Mexico moves that Senate bill 33 be made a special order for Thursday, January 29, at 2 o'clock, and the junior Senator from Utah moves to amend by striking out "Thursday, January 29," and inserting in lieu thereof "Monday, February 2."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. KING. I call for a division.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, may I not appeal to the Senator from New Mexico to accept Monday as suggested by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BURSUM. I am perfectly willing to accept Monday if Monday is agreeable to the Senate. I will accept the modification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico modifies his motion in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, and the question is now upon agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico as modified.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand the motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not debatable.

Mr. OVERMAN. It requires a two-thirds vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It requires a two-thirds vote to adopt it. The Chair feels that in order to ascertain whether there is a two-thirds majority for the motion it will be necessary to have the roll called. The clerk will call the roll upon agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico as modified.

The reading clerk called the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. BURSUM. My colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], has requested me to announce that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. FERNALD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. In view of the announcement that that Senator, if present, would vote as I have voted, I will let my vote stand.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], if present, would vote "yea" on this motion. They are all unavoidably absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—53

Ashurst	Fernald	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.
Ball	Ferris	Keyes	Sheppard
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	Frazier	McLean	Smith
Bursum	Gerry	McNary	Swanson
Capper	Gooding	Means	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Harrell	Neely	Watson
Couzens	Harris	Norbeck	Weller
Cummins	Harrison	Overman	Wheeler
Curtis	Heflin	Owen	Willis
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	

NAYS—18

Bayard	Ernst	Moses	Sterling
Bingham	George	Oddie	Wadsworth
Bruce	Greene	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Butler	King	Reed, Pa.	
Caraway	Metcalf	Shields	

NOT VOTING—25

Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Stephens
Edge	Ladd	Robinson	Trammell
Edwards	La Follette	Shortridge	Underwood
Elkins	Leafoot	Smoot	Warren
Glass	McCormick	Spencer	
Hale	Mayfield	Stanfield	
Howell	Norris	Stanley	

So Mr. BURSUM's motion, as modified, was agreed to, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting being recorded in the affirmative.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10947) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Monongahela River in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., and I submit a report (No. 919) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to the report.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from Texas. It is a bridge bill in the usual form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPE COD CANAL

Mr. FERNALD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 3933) for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 924) thereon. I understand that the views of the minority on the bill are to be presented, and I ask that they be printed at the same time with the majority report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit the views of the minority on the bill just reported by the Senator from Maine to accompany the majority report.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Maine if the majority views of the committee have been filed with the bill?

Mr. FERNALD. They have been.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been as yet no order made for the printing of the majority report of the committee and the views of the minority. Is it desired that that shall be done?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand they will be printed in the usual course.

Mr. FERNALD. I ask that the majority report of the committee together with the views of the minority may be printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As one document?

Mr. FERNALD. As one document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be so printed.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF BENNINGTON AND INDEPENDENCE OF VERMONT

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent in behalf of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3895) to authorize the coinage of gold \$1 pieces and silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Bennington and the independence of Vermont.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read, and, there being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to its consideration.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments in section 1, on page 1, line 6, after the name "United States," to strike out "gold \$1 pieces" and insert "silver 50-cent pieces"; in line 7, after the words "number of," to strike out "twenty" and insert "forty"; in the same line, after the word "thousand," to strike out "and silver 50-cent pieces to the number of 15,000"; in line 8, after the word "such," to strike out "\$1 pieces and"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "said," to strike out "\$1 pieces and," so as to make the section read:

That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Bennington and the independence of Vermont there shall be coined in the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of 40,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Bennington and the independence of Vermont."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the New York World of this morning contains an article sent from Washington on yesterday, the headlines of which read as follows:

Stone and Warren face a real fight.

Then, in the body of the story, it contains this statement:

Mr. Stone's confirmation is to be fought on the floor of the Senate. OVERMAN, of North Carolina, and HEFLIN, of Alabama, are expected to fight him on the score of his having been a Morgan attorney—a return compliment for the Republican attacks on John W. Davis on the same count.

Mr. President, that is not the reason why I am opposing Mr. Stone for confirmation as a Supreme Court judge. The Senator from North Carolina, I am sure, is not opposing him for that reason.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. The reason why I am opposing him is because—

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a question?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator think it is in order to discuss that matter in open session?

Mr. HEFLIN. I think, since the newspaper has misrepresented me, that I have a right to give my position in the matter.

Mr. WATSON. I am rather inclined to the opinion that that matter is for executive discussion only.

Mr. HEFLIN. I agree with the Senator about certain phases of the matter; but the reason why I am opposing Mr. Stone is because of the case in which he appeared for the heirs of J. Pierpont Morgan, an argument that he made in the Supreme Court.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas raises a point of order, which he will state.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Alabama is discussing a matter that should be disposed of in executive session, and if he insists on making his speech I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. The press—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. A Senator should not be attacked in newspaper articles and then be denied in the open session of the Senate the opportunity of having the country know his position. He should have a chance to be heard in the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the point of order raised?

Mr. CURTIS. That the Senator is discussing a matter that ought to be discussed in executive session.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator has a right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has not gone far enough with his remarks to enable the Chair to determine the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. I think if the Chair had heard the Senator the Chair would have concluded that he had, because he said he was giving his reasons for opposing the confirmation of a man whose name is before the Senate to-day for confirmation.

Mr. HEFLIN. But, Mr. President, the New York World said that I was opposing him because he had been an attorney for J. Pierpont Morgan, and that I was retaliating because Republicans had attacked John W. Davis for the same reason. That is not my reason; that is not the truth; and I am entitled to state the truth in the open session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that matters concerning the confirmation of a nomination made by the President must be discussed in executive session unless the Senate decides to open the discussion to the public, which has often been done by a motion to consider a nomination in open executive session.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, my point is that I am trying to state the facts showing just why this newspaper statement is not correct.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator desires to answer what he alleges is an attack upon him, and perhaps impugning his motives—I have not read the article—he has a right to deny it in open session and say that it is not true; but when he takes the affirmative side and attempts to give the reasons why he is opposing the nomination of Mr. Stone, then he is discussing a matter which under our rules can be discussed alone in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the rules provide for the consideration of nominations in executive session, and has sustained the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I was stating that this article in the newspaper did me an injustice; that the reason given was not my reason for opposing the confirmation of Mr. Stone, and that I wanted to state to the Senate and the country just wherein it was not a correct statement; and the Chair holds that a Senator may be attacked in the press, and the people of the country read the attack, and have his motives impugned and himself misrepresented, and when the Senator rises on the floor to reply to the misrepresentations he must go behind closed doors and shut out the public and remain silent, so far as the public is concerned, permitting the misrepresentations to remain unanswered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That may be a reason for changing the rules of the Senate, but it does not affect the case until the rules are changed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Chair hold that I can not rise to a question of personal privilege and give my reasons?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Chair does not so hold.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the matter that I desire to discuss in setting myself right in regard to this statement is a matter of record. The case in which Mr. Stone appeared was argued before the Supreme Court, and he made the last argument in behalf of the heirs of J. Pierpont Morgan. I have told several newspaper men that I thought this matter ought to be looked into because of his connection with the case I have mentioned.

Mr. WATSON. Now, Mr. President, I must insist on the point of order. I do not think that the Senator, under the cloak of personal privilege, has the right to discuss a matter which otherwise he is not permitted to discuss. He is proceeding to give the reasons why he is opposing the confirmation of Mr. Stone. He is proceeding to do it on the theory that he is discussing a question of personal privilege; but, nevertheless, whatever the excuse for the speech it is a violation of the rules, and he is discussing a confirmation in open session,

whereas our rules provide that it must be done only in executive session. If a Senator may rise to a question of personal privilege and discuss a proposition of this kind, or any proposition relating to the confirmation of anybody for any office before the Senate, then we may as well abandon the executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What point of order does the Senator from Indiana make?

Mr. WATSON. I make the point of order that the Senator from Alabama is discussing a matter which relates solely to the confirmation of Attorney General Stone as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, giving the reasons for his opposition to it, and that that must be done in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Alabama can discuss a question of personal privilege, but the discussion of the merits of a particular nomination now before the Senate in executive session is not a question of personal privilege.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I agree to the proposition that in open session we can not discuss, under any pretext, the question of the confirmation of a particular man who has been nominated for an office, but I deny that there is any rule which prohibits a Member of this body from discussing any man or any fact relating to any man merely because that man's name may be before the Senate for confirmation. He can not discuss the question whether he should be confirmed or not confirmed, but there is no rule which makes a man immune from discussion or criticism merely because his name comes before this body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has risen to a question of personal privilege, and the matter decided by the Chair was that he could not discuss the confirmation of a nomination before the Senate as a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama, the Chair is sure, understands far better than the Chair does, indeed, because he has had more experience what is a question of personal privilege, and the Chair relies upon the Senator from Alabama to confine himself to what he understands to be a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am afraid, if I understand the Chair, that I do not agree with the Chair. Does the Chair hold that I can not mention the name of a man whose name is associated with my name this morning in the press of the country, and incorrect accusations contained in a statement concerning me regarding that man? Does the Chair propose to hold that I can not mention the name of Mr. Stone?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not intend to hold any such thing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then, Mr. President, Mr. Stone, the present Attorney General of the United States, appeared in a case in the Supreme Court representing the heirs of J. Pierpont Morgan in a suit instituted in the State of Delaware. An attachment proceeding was issued in the Delaware court against Mr. Ownbey, of Colorado. The bond was suggested by the attorneys of Mr. Morgan, and the amount was placed at \$200,000.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. The present Attorney General was not at that time in attendance at the trial in the lower court. But he—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota rises to a point of order.

Mr. STERLING. I make the point of order on the ground that the statement being made by the Senator from Alabama has reference to matters which shall be considered in executive session, and there only, and which have no relation to personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Alabama is not discussing a question of personal privilege.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I move that we proceed in open executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Stone.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion can only be made after the Senate has entered into executive session. If any Senator desires that the Senate shall proceed to the con-

sideration of executive business, and a motion to that effect being carried, then the motion made by the Senator from North Carolina will be in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that we go into executive session, and after we are in executive session I shall make a motion that we proceed in open executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. WATSON. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] and vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] and vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], whose pair has already been announced, if present, would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] has a general pair with his colleague [Mr. ERNST] and if present he would also vote "yea."

I also desire to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is paired with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN].

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] is unavoidably absent to-day. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HARRISON. My colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HALE] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call resulted—yeas 37, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—37

Ashurst	Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead
Bayard	Fletcher	Mayfield	Simmons
Borah	George	Neely	Smith
Brookhart	Gerry	Norris	Swanson
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Bruce	Harrison	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Hefflin	Ralston	Wheeler
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Ransdell	
Dial	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	
Dill	King	Sheppard	

NAYS—36

Ball	Ernst	Keyes	Phipps
Bingham	Fernald	McKinley	Reed, Pa.
Bursum	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Butler	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Gooding	Means	Sterling
Couzens	Greene	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cummins	Harrell	Moses	Warren
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Norbeck	Watson
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Willis

NOT VOTING—23

Cameron	Howell	Owen	Stanley
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Stephens
Edwards	Ladd	Robinson	Trammell
Elkins	La Follette	Shields	Underwood
Glass	Lenroot	Spencer	Weller
Hale	McCormick	Stanfield	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 37, the nays are 36; so the motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate thereupon proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that January 24, 1923, the President approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to accept the gift of Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge for the construction of an auditorium in connection with the Library of Congress and to provide for the erection thereof.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11749) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAYS CONGRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning a Pan American Highways Congress, to meet at Buenos Aires on May 22, 1925, in which the participation of the Government of the United States has been invited by the Government of the Argentine Republic. Accompanying the report are copies of letters from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture furnishing information regarding the Congress and urging the importance of participation therein by the United States.

In view of the strength of these representations and in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, I request of Congress legislation which will authorize an appropriation of \$15,000 for the expenses of delegates of the United States to the Pan American Congress of Highways, to meet at Buenos Aires on May 22, 1925.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 24, 1923.

LAFAYETTE RIVER DAM AND BRIDGE, VIRGINIA

Mr. SWANSON. There is on the calendar a bridge bill in the usual form, which I am very anxious to get to the House. It has been approved by the War Department. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3398) to authorize the city of Norfolk, Va., to construct a dam from the southern and northern banks of Lafayette River to the southern and northern edges of the channel of said river.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments. In line 5, after the word "construct," to strike out "and maintain a dam from the southern and northern banks of Lafayette River to the southern and northern edges of the channel of said river, where Granby Street, Norfolk, Va., crosses the same, in connection with the construction at said point of a lift draw and tide gates," and insert "maintain and operate a combined dam and bridge in Lafayette River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Granby Street, Norfolk, Va.: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy."

And to insert a new section to be numbered "section 2," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Norfolk, a municipal corporation, situated in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, to construct, maintain, and operate a combined dam and bridge in Lafayette River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Granby Street, Norfolk, Va.: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy.

SEC. 2. That the authority granted by this act shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That from and

after 30 days' notice from the Federal Power Commission, or other authorized agency of the United States, to said city, that desirable water-power development will be interfered with by the existence of said dam, the authority hereby granted to construct, maintain, and operate said dam shall terminate and be at an end; and any grantee or licensee of the United States proposing to develop a power project at or near said dam shall have authority to remove, submerge, or utilize said dam under such conditions as said commission or other agency may determine, but such conditions shall not include compensation for the removal, submergence, or utilization of said dam.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the city of Norfolk, Va., to construct a combined dam and bridge in Lafayette River at or near Granby Street, Norfolk, Va."

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MOSES. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask that the War Department appropriation bill be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11248) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Finance Department, pay, etc., of the Army," on page 10, line 21, to increase the appropriation for additional pay for length of service to enlisted men from \$2,400,000 to \$2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "Miscellaneous," so as to read:

For pay and allowances of contract surgeons, \$41,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Mileage of the Army," on page 13, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "transports" and insert "vessels for which no transportation fare is charged," so as to make the paragraph read:

For mileage, reimbursement of actual traveling expenses, or per diem allowances in lieu thereof, as authorized by law, to commissioned officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, \$800,000; and officers and other members of the Military Establishment named in this paragraph performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 15, line 21, after the words "sum of" to strike out "\$100" and insert "\$1,200," so as to read:

Subsistence of the Army: Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue as rations to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), Indians employed by the Army as guides and scouts, and general prisoners at posts; for the subsistence of the masters, officers,

crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army Transport Service; hot coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; for sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of \$1,200 is authorized to be expended for supplying meals or furnishing commutation of rations to enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard while competitors in the national rifle match.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment proposing to insert \$1,200 was an error. Another cipher should have been added to the amount, making it \$12,000. I move that the amendment be amended in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 15, line 21, strike out "\$1,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 10, to increase the appropriation for transportation of the Army and its supplies from \$15,774,953 to \$15,814,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Barracks and quarters," on page 27, line 4, after the word "condition," to strike out the semicolon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That \$3,500 of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of approximately 43.6 acres of land opposite the Fort Reno, Okla., pumping plant, to be used in an effort to straighten the course of the North Canadian River.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air Service, Army," on page 38, line 5, after the words "may be," to strike out "desired by the Chief of Air Service, United States Army," and insert "designated by the President," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy and the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation are hereby directed to transfer to the War Department for this purpose not to exceed two obsolete naval craft and two obsolete Shipping Board or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation vessels, respectively, of such types as may be designated by the President, for the purpose set forth herein; and not exceeding \$500,000 shall be available immediately toward the transfer of the testing and experimental plant of the Air Service now located at McCook Field, Dayton, Ohio, and the reestablishment thereof on a permanent site in the same vicinity, including the preparation of grounds, construction of buildings, installation of roadways and utilities, and all other expenses of whatever character connected with this project, provided that such a site, satisfactory to the Secretary of War and on terms approved by him, is provided for this purpose without cost to the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 19, after the word "thereof," to strike out "the provisions herein made with reference to helium, for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith, shall apply also to the Navy Department," and insert:

Authorization as herein granted for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experiments therewith is likewise hereby granted to the Navy Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Seacoast defenses, insular possessions," on page 48, line 17, to increase the appropriation for the installation and replacement of electric light and power plants and the purchase and installation of searchlights at the seacoast fortifications of the Hawaiian Islands, from \$12,000 to \$24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Seacoast defenses, Panama Canal," on page 49, line 10, to increase the appropriation for the installation and replacement of electric light and power plants, and the purchase and installation of searchlights for the seacoast fortifications on the Canal Zone, from \$12,000 to \$24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Chemical Warfare Service, Army," on page 57, line 17, after the word "ranges" to strike out "\$882,980," and insert "\$907,980, of which sum not more than \$25,000 may be used in completing agricultural experiments in exterminating the cotton boll weevil," so as to read:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical warfare gases or other toxic substances, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for gas-warfare purposes, including all necessary investigations, research, design, experimentation, and operations connected therewith; purchase of chemicals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instruments; construction, maintenance, and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of supplies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and adding machines, including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and instruments; for incidental expenses; for civilian employees; for libraries of the Chemical Warfare Service and subscriptions to periodicals which may be paid for in advance; for expenses incidental to the organization, training, and equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for, including the training of the Army in chemical warfare, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; for current expenses of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, including construction and maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, alterations, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets, clearing and grading ranges, \$907,980, of which sum not more than \$25,000 may be used in completing agricultural experiments in exterminating the cotton boll weevil.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Seacoast defenses, insular possessions," on page 62, line 5, after the word "stations," to insert "general communication system," and at the end of line 17 to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For construction of fire-control stations, general communication system, and accessories, including purchase of lands and rights of way, purchase and installation of necessary lines and means of electrical communication, including telephones, dial and other telegraphs, wiring and all special instruments, apparatus and materials, coast-signal apparatus, subaqueous, sound, and flash ranging apparatus, including their development, and salaries of electrical experts, engineers, and other necessary employees connected with the use of Coast Artillery; purchase, manufacture, and test of range finders and other instruments for fire control at the fortifications, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture in the Hawaiian Islands, \$150,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, that seems to be a very large increase. Will the Senator please explain it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Budget estimate for that item, if my recollection is correct, was \$273,000. The House cut it down to \$40,000. On the testimony submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations it was believed that the House cut was too savage, and the Senate committee has compromised between the two amounts and fixed it at \$150,000. It is still over \$100,000 below the estimate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," on page 66, line 23, after the figures "\$1,444,905," to insert:

and in addition thereto the sum of \$16,000 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

So as to read:

For the procurement of forage, bedding, and so forth, for animals used by the National Guard, \$1,444,905, and in addition thereto the sum of \$16,000 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$635,000," so as to read:

For expenses, camps of instruction, \$9,900,000, and in addition thereto the sum of \$635,000 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 12, after the figures "\$325,000," to insert "and in addition thereto the sum of \$15,500 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924,' is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926," so as to read:

For expenses, selected officers and enlisted men, military service schools, \$325,000, and in addition thereto the sum of \$15,500 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 18, after the figures "\$72,000," to insert "and in addition thereto the sum of \$1,800 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924,' is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926," so as to read:

For pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, \$72,000, and in addition thereto the sum of \$1,800 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 5, after the figures "\$350,000," to insert "and in addition thereto the sum of \$31,250 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924,' is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926," so as to read:

For transportation of equipment and supplies, \$350,000, and in addition thereto the sum of \$31,250 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 14, before the word "from," to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$968,750," so as to read:

For pay of National Guard (armory drills), \$9,990,000, and in addition thereto the sum of \$968,750 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Arms, uniforms, equipment, etc., for field service, National Guard," on page 69, line 7, after the figures "\$3,119,281" to insert "and in addition thereto the sum of \$62,500 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924,' is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926, so as to read:

To procure by purchase or manufacture and issue from time to time to the National Guard, upon requisition of the governors of the several States and Territories, or the commanding general, National Guard of the District of Columbia, such military equipment and stores of all kinds and a reserve supply thereof as are necessary to arm, uniform, and equip for field service the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and to repair such of the aforementioned articles of equipment and military stores as are or may become damaged when, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, such repair may be determined to be an economical measure and as necessary for their proper preservation and use, \$3,119,281, and in addition thereto the sum of \$62,500 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Militia Bureau, War Department," on page 70, line 8, after the figures "\$127,560" to insert "And in addition thereto the sum of \$12,000 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924,' is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926," so as to read:

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$127,560, and in addition thereto the sum of \$12,000 from the unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, 1924," is continued and made available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves," on page 70, line 16, after the word "training," to strike out "\$2,457,900" and insert "\$2,293,500"; in line 19, after the word "law," to strike out "\$300,466" and insert "\$400,000"; and in line 21, after the word "law," to strike out "\$390,000" and insert "\$449,300," so as to read:

Officers' Reserve Corps: For pay and allowances of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps on active duty for not exceeding 15 days' training, \$2,293,500; for pay and allowances of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps on active duty for more than 15 days in accordance with law, \$400,000; for mileage, reimbursement of actual traveling expenses, or per diem allowances in lieu thereof as authorized by law, \$449,300.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There seems to be a considerable change from the amounts fixed by the House. Will the Senator explain the items?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall be very glad to do so. The House appropriated \$2,457,900 for the pay of reserve officers attending the 15-day training camps which are held in the summer. Under that item 18,000 officers could be paid for that duty. In increasing, as the House did, the number of officers who could go to such camps and be paid, they omitted to increase the mileage item which, of course, pays their traveling expenses. The mileage item is found in line 21.

The Senate committee, when it tackled the problem, made up its mind that it would not increase the total appropriation in the paragraph as contained in those items, the item in line 16, the item in line 19, and the item in line 21. So we readjusted the items, reducing the item in line 16, from \$2,457,900 to \$2,293,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does that reduce the number of officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It reduces the number of officers to 16,500; but we take that reduction and apply it to the mileage item in order to get mileage to pay for the transportation of those officers. Likewise in the item in line 19, it is a readjustment with no increase in the appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 3, to strike out "\$3,148,366" and insert "\$3,142,800," so as to read:

In all, \$3,142,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to increase the appropriation for "Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 75, line 4, from "\$3,818,020" to "\$3,828,020."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 22, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$100" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the additional proviso read:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$10,000 of the total appropriated by this act may be expended for the transportation of authorized Reserve Officers' Training Corps students who may be competitors in the national rifle match, and to subsist them while traveling to and from said match and while remaining thereat.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 5, after the word "services" to insert "not exceeding \$15,000"; and at the end of line 13, to strike out "\$49,560" and insert "\$85,000," so as to read:

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors; for clerical services not exceeding \$15,000; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, and their participation in national and international matches, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and to remain available until expended, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$100" and insert "\$80,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That out of this appropriation there may be expended not to exceed \$80,000 for the payment of transportation, for supplying

meals or furnishing commutation of subsistence of civilian rifle teams authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in the national matches.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps, National Cemeteries," on page 83, line 9, after the word "cemeteries," to strike out "\$85,000, of which amount \$15,000 shall be expended by the Secretary of War in erecting a fitting marking of the burial place at Bardstown, Ky., of Lieut. John Fitch, soldier and inventor," and insert "\$70,000," so as to read:

For continuing the work of furnishing headstones of durable stone or other durable material for unmarked graves of Union and Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines, and soldiers, sailors, and marines of all other wars in national post, city, town, and village cemeteries, naval cemeteries at navy yards and stations of the United States, and other burial places, under the acts of March 3, 1873, February 3, 1879, and March 9, 1906; continuing the work of furnishing headstones for unmarked graves of civilians interred in post cemeteries under the acts of April 28, 1904, and June 30, 1906; and furnishing headstones for the unmarked graves of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines in national cemeteries, \$70,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that that item be temporarily passed over. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is interested in it. He asked me that he might have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have just sent for the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rivers and harbors," on page 93, line 11, to reduce the appropriation for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors for which there may be no special appropriation, from "\$300,000" to "\$250,000."

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from New York why that item is reduced \$50,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee, in giving consideration to the item for examination and surveys and contingencies of river and harbor work, came to the conclusion that the Board of Army Engineers could proceed with all reasonable dispatch with the sum of \$250,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Mississippi to refer to the flood-control item.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I was first referring to the \$250,000 item. I was under the impression that there was a new bill pending which would carry with it some more surveys and investigations. This is the item which takes care of that work, is it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. If the \$250,000 be adequate to carry on the work of those surveys which have already been provided for and if Congress should pass the new bill, which in all probability it will, it would take quite a good deal more money, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it fair to say in that connection that a goodly portion of the similar appropriation during the current fiscal year, as I recollect it, has been spent in carrying on a survey of the proposed Lake Erie to Ohio River Canal. A pretty large sum has been spent upon that; in fact, a large portion of the appropriation has been expended in that way, if my recollection is correct. That work has progressed to a considerable extent, and the committee believes that, with that work pretty fairly well under way, not so large an appropriation will be needed in the next fiscal year, even taking into consideration the possible passage of a new river and harbor project bill.

Mr. HARRISON. At the time the Senator's committee obtained that information, they did take into consideration the new projects that might be adopted in the new bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They did.

Mr. HARRISON. That was considered in reporting the amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was.

Mr. HARRISON. The appropriation for river and harbor work was very materially cut, as the Senator from New York knows, in the House Committee on Appropriations, and I should dislike to see \$50,000 lopped off this item, if it was estimated for by the Budget Bureau; if it can be reasonably expended, and if it is needed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can merely say that the members of the Committee on Appropriations were convinced that the amount proposed to be appropriated would be sufficient.

Mr. HARRISON. I know nothing about the facts, and I am merely trying to elicit information, but I regret to see the reduction made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may say that on the committee are some Senators who are especially familiar with the river and harbor work.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that the appropriation of \$40,000,000 which is carried in the bill is according to the estimate of the engineers and according to the report of the Director of the Budget. I believe the Budget Director reported an amount somewhat less, but that is the estimate of the engineers. I think I am correct in that. That appropriation, of course, is intended, as it is stated:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable—

That takes care of the river and harbor work.

The other item to which the Senator refers is simply for surveys. That has nothing to do with the carrying on of the work that is now under way and that has heretofore been authorized.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that, but I have the impression—I do not know where I got it—that the intention of the House Committee on Appropriations was at first to appropriate some fifty-odd million dollars for river and harbor improvements. Then, finally, it was reduced to \$40,000,000. I do not know what the estimate was, but I read that statement in a newspaper.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator has those figures somewhat confused with the river and harbor bill which is now before the Committee on Commerce. It was contemplated originally that the authorizations in that bill and appropriations to take care of projects embodied in it would require something like \$52,000,000, I believe. At the instance of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the other House as many as three bills were introduced there, the first one having been introduced last June.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is referring to bills for new improvements?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am referring to the river and harbor bill. They finally reduced the authorizations contained in that bill to a lower figure, to about \$39,000,000. I think that is where the talk in reference to an appropriation of \$52,000,000 originated. It was in connection with the river and harbor bill which was introduced, but which has been modified, and the authorizations contained therein decreased.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, if that bill becomes a law—and we hope it will become a law—during this session, there will be another appropriation bill providing for those projects.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; but that appropriation bill will carry a less amount than at first it was intended that it should.

Mr. HARRISON. The \$40,000,000 is all that was estimated for and will do the work so far as maintenance is concerned?

Mr. FLETCHER. It will be sufficient, it is assumed, for carrying on the work that has heretofore been approved and adopted. I do not think we ought for a moment to consider the possibility of not passing a river and harbor bill at this session. I think the bill ought to come out of the committee, and I believe it will come out of the committee very soon. It ought to come before the Senate, and it ought to be passed at this session beyond any question. I hope that it will be passed. I trust it may be taken up at an early time, so that any changes or amendments that may be offered to the bill which would have to go to conference may be disposed of before Congress adjourns.

I think we must figure in the pending bill on taking care of the surveys which will be authorized by the river and harbor bill. The engineers undoubtedly had that in mind when the estimate was made for \$300,000. The committee proposes to reduce that to \$250,000. That may raise some question as to whether or not the engineers will have sufficient funds with which to make the surveys. I hope they will have; but I really think that the amendment ought to be disagreed to, for the reason that this money is not spent unless it is needed. It merely provides for the necessary work in making the surveys. If it is not needed for that purpose, it is not spent. I should like always to be on the safe side. That is the view I take of that. The engineers figured that they would need \$300,000; it is possible that they can make the surveys with \$250,000; but I am quite sure that we ought to give them enough to take care of the surveys that are covered in the pending river and harbor bill. However, there is not a great deal of difference between the \$300,000 and the amount provided by the bill, and

I am inclined to think the engineers might probably get along with the \$250,000 when the surveys shall be provided in the river and harbor bill; but if they shall not be able to do that after the river and harbor bill shall have passed, we might provide for an additional amount in a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree with the Senator in what he has said touching the river and harbor bill. I think it is very necessary that that measure should be passed, and, as I understand, the Senator from New York, the chairman of the committee, is in favor of the river and harbor bill and of carrying out the projects therein provided for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 93, line 24, after the figures "\$10,000,000," to insert a semicolon and the following proviso:

Provided, That \$40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended in revetting and protecting the yards of the barge line at Memphis, Tenn., in accordance with plans of the chief of the barge line service.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the provisions of the proviso, but I do not think the amount devoted to the purpose specified should come out of the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for flood control. I ask the Senator from New York if he will not consent to have this item adopted as a separate provision without providing that the amount shall be taken from the \$10,000,000 appropriation. Whenever we deduct appropriations for specific projects from the \$10,000,000 appropriation which is necessary and ought to be provided for flood control it gives encouragement to other places to ask that they be given an amount out of that fund, and so it will go.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this matter was brought to the attention of the committee by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], who explained that the Government barge line or the Inland Waterways' Corporation, which is owned by the Government, has expended something like a million dollars at Memphis in building terminals, docks, railway tracks, and so forth, and that those docks and railway yards and storehouses are threatened by the river undermining them and sweeping them away.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not only threatened, but that has actually taken place already. The water has invaded the Government's property there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The item is to provide that the Government's own property shall be protected.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator did not answer my question. I am heartily in favor of this appropriation of \$40,000 to take care of this work; no doubt it is necessary; but why make it a charge on the \$10,000,000 flood-control appropriation? Why not appropriate the \$40,000 outside of that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In reply to that question, Mr. President, I may say that I am not authorized to accept the provision in the form of a separate item involving a new appropriation. It has not been estimated for by the Budget; it has not been passed upon by a standing committee in that form, and a point of order would lie against it in any but its present form.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not going to make any point of order and I am not going to object to it, but if any other proposition comes in to charge other expenditures to the lump-sum appropriation of \$10,000,000 I shall oppose it, because the \$10,000,000 should be appropriated and utilized for flood-control work. This item should come under a separate heading for the protection of the barge line, or the amount should come out of the Treasury as a separate item, or it should be provided for in some other way, as in the case of other appropriations which are made by the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to my friend from Mississippi for taking the position that he does about this appropriation. It is absolutely necessary to have it in order to protect the Government's property at Memphis. The river is already making inroads into it, and it is vitally necessary to the conduct of the barge line that this appropriation be made. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his forbearance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers," on page 97, line 8, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$300,000," and at the end of line 11 to strike out "\$979,500" and insert "\$879,500," so as to read:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: Current expenses, \$71,000; subsistence, \$300,000; household, \$152,000; hospital, \$289,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$52,000; farm, \$15,000; in all, Northwestern Branch, \$879,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 26, after the figures "\$160,000," to strike out "but no part of this shall be expended in furnishing other than the regulation Civil War uniform for members, veterans of the War for the Union," so as to read:

For clothing for all branches; labor, materials, machines, tools, and appliances employed and for use in the tailor shops and shoe shops, or other home shops in which any kind of clothing is made or repaired, \$160,000.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, it will be noticed that in the provision at the bottom of page 98 and the top of page 99 the House bill makes the following provision:

but no part of this shall be expended in furnishing other than the regulation Civil War uniform for members, veterans of the War for the Union.

It has been brought to my attention, Mr. President, that the veterans of the Civil War who are at present inmates of the National Soldiers' Home at Dayton, Ohio, look with a great deal of favor on the House provision, because, as a matter of sentiment, they desire to have the blue uniform which was the one they wore at the time of the civil strife. They naturally take pride in that uniform, just as the Confederate veterans take honorable pride in the uniform of gray. So it is desired by many of them, instead of being furnished with the khaki uniforms which are now supplied to them, that they may be permitted to wear the old blue uniforms which they wore when they marched away and when they were fighting the battles of the country. As I understand, the House provision will accomplish that purpose.

It may be said, it is true, that it is only a matter of sentiment; but, after all, Mr. President, the world is moved to a great extent by sentiment; the actions of nations are controlled largely by sentiment, and it seems to me, frankly speaking, that this is a worthy sentiment. Talking with these old veterans one can very readily understand their feeling with reference to the type of uniform which they shall be permitted to wear. They feel it almost a sacrilege to discard the blue. While they honor the khaki uniform for those who wore that uniform in the World War, they feel that that was not their uniform. The khaki uniform is just as good as the blue, and it would perhaps be distasteful to the veterans of the World War if they were required to wear the blue uniform; but at all events, for the old veterans of the Civil War, it seems to me that we ought to make provision for them, so that they shall be permitted to wear the blue in which they marched away and fought.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think I can explain the attitude of the Senate committee. The Senate committee struck out this proviso which in effect would compel the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Homes to reclothe 20,000 men. The members of the homes now are clothed in the olive drab suits which are made from the cloth acquired by the War Department during the war and of which there is a considerable surplus. The members of the Board of Managers have been able to clothe the members of the homes from this surplus stock. I have taken occasion, since my attention was first directed to this provision adopted by the House, to inquire of a member of the Board of Managers as to whether or not there was any insistent sentiment in the homes among the Civil War veterans that the blue cloth should be used as it was prior to our participation in the war against Germany, and the information I receive from him is that this is the first time he has ever heard of it.

If this provision is retained in the bill, we will have to appropriate approximately \$500,000 in order to carry out its provisions. No member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, so far as my knowledge goes, has ever been approached upon this subject by any veteran of the Civil War. It may be that some one has found some sentiment in favor of this change in the home at Dayton, Ohio. It has not reached the committee nor has it reached the Board of Managers.

I may say that the Spanish War veterans who are now members of the homes are entirely satisfied, apparently, with the clothing provided for them by the Government, and yet in the Spanish war the uniform was blue. The World War veterans, who are now coming to the homes in increasing numbers, are satisfied with these uniforms. The appearance certainly is neat and satisfactory in every way. I have visited one or more of the homes and have seen them. I merely want to say to the Senate that this provision, which was adopted upon the floor of the House without any consideration by any standing committee, if insisted upon, will call for an expenditure of something like \$500,000.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from New York can state offhand what is the probable surplus of this olive-drab cloth which the Government now has?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not remember the figures; indeed, I am not informed as to the figures up to date; but, to the best of my recollection, about two years ago the Government had several million yards of olive-drab cloth in the bolt, and it is from that surplus stock that the Regular Army and the National Guard have been clothed and are now being clothed, and also the members of the soldiers' homes.

Mr. WILLIS. The purpose of that question was to bring out the very apparent fact that if there is not a large surplus of this olive-drab cloth on hand now there probably will be no additional expense, because if the Government must buy new cloth out of which to make this clothing it could buy the blue as cheaply as it could buy the olive drab; so that after this surplus is exhausted there would be no additional expense, it seems to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The surplus is not exhausted.

Mr. WILLIS. But the Senator is not able to state whether or not it is a large surplus, so that there would be any considerable loss. If it is a small surplus, the loss, of course, would be inconsequential, because it would be used, as he has already explained, by the other branches of the service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The surplus is plenty large enough to clothe all the military elements taken care of in this bill certainly throughout the entire fiscal year to come and then have a lot left over.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I believe that this is a matter of enough importance, even though it is simply a matter of sentiment, to warrant the additional expenditure. I believe that the amendment proposed by the committee ought not to be agreed to, and that the matter should be allowed to stand as it was in the bill as it came from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it.

Mr. FESS. I call for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 17, to reduce the total appropriation for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from "\$7,681,200" to "\$7,581,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments as printed in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to ask unanimous consent for the adoption of a comparatively small number of amendments which may be termed legislative in character. I propose the first one, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York proposes an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hereafter no commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps shall be deprived of his right to pay and allowances while serving on such duty as the President may direct in the coordination of the business of the Government as now being conducted by him under the general supervision of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration and adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York offers an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 68, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hereafter no money allowance for the rental of quarters shall be paid to members of the National Guard when called to duty under the provisions of sections 94, 97, or 99 of the national defense act, as amended, for a period of not exceeding 31 days, if quarters for their personal accommodation during such period are provided by the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think it incumbent upon me to make a statement in connection with this amendment; and my statement will apply also to an amendment of a similar character which the committee has instructed me to offer in connection with the Organized Reserves items. It is a matter of some importance, sufficiently so to warrant a statement of it to go in the Record.

Under present law an officer of the Regular Army who is not housed in public quarters but must find quarters for himself and family, either by owning or renting a residence or apartment, receives a rental allowance from the Government. That allowance is paid to him in varying sums, in proportion to his rank. That law applies not only to regular officers but to officers of the National Guard and to officers of the Reserve Corps whenever they are on active duty.

This point has arisen, and I want to emphasize it:

An officer of the Organized Reserves, for example, is ordered to attend a 15-day training camp. When he reports at that camp he is paid the pay of his grade plus the allowances. One of the allowances, or part of the pay, is credit for longevity service. Under existing legislation, that officer, who has left his own home, but leaves his family in his home with no disturbance whatsoever in connection with their living conditions and with no added expense imposed upon him, goes to a training camp for a 15-day period and during that period receives a rental allowance from the Government.

Your committee believes that the spirit of the pay act of 1922 relative to the payment of rental allowances to officers does not include any such situation as that. The officer attending a National Guard encampment but for 15 days, or a reserve officer attending a training camp but for 15 days, has been put to no expense with respect to his quarters or his home. The committee believes that hereafter the rental allowance should not be paid to guard officers or reserve officers attending training camp so long as the Government provides the officer quarters for his personal use while at such a camp. He does not have to expend any money out of his own pocket for his own shelter during that training period. The object of this amendment applicable to the National Guard chapter is to withhold the payment of that rental allowance, and a similar amendment will be offered in a moment to withhold it in the case of reserve officers.

I may say that when the committee had this matter brought to its attention, and the whole spirit of the 1922 pay act in connection with rental allowances was explained and discussed, the committee was unanimous in the belief that the payment of a rental allowance under these circumstances constituted an abuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I offer a similar amendment applicable to the Organized Reserve chapter; and if that is adopted I propose to make another redistribution of the appropriations in that chapter without increasing the sum total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 71, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hereafter no money allowance for the rental of quarters shall be paid to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called to active duty for a period of not exceeding 31 days, if quarters for their personal accommodation during such period are provided by the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, let me call to the attention of the Senate an immediate effect of the adoption of these two amendments, especially the last one.

The adoption of this amendment will decrease by something over \$400,000 the amount of money to be paid to reserve officers during the next training season in these 15-day training camps and in the 30-day instruction camps. That is the saving immediately effected. In other words, for the same amount of money as has been appropriated in this chapter entitled "Organized Reserves," a much larger number of officers can receive the training. The appropriation adopted a while ago in connection with the Organized Reserves is sufficient to train for a 15-day period this next summer 16,500 officers, and to send for training for longer periods than 15 days at Army service schools 650 officers. With the adoption of this legislative amendment we can now train in the 15-day training camps nineteen thousand and some hundreds of officers, and in the training in excess of 15 days 950 officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. What page has the Senator before him?
Mr. WADSWORTH. Page 70.

So I ask the Senate to adopt a readjustment of those three items, which will be found on lines 16, 19, and 21. The readjustment will involve no increase in the sum total of the three, but will actually permit a total of 21,000 reserve officers to receive training this next year—a consummation, to my mind, devoutly to be wished. It can be done on account of the legislative amendment which has just been adopted.

So, Mr. President, I ask for the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 70, line 16, was agreed to, in order that the figures "\$2,293,500" may be changed to "\$2,087,402."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was adopted is reconsidered, and the Senator from New York proposes an amendment to the amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, the Senator from New York proposes to insert the figures "\$2,087,402."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amount represented in that reduction is to be used in increasing the next two items by the same amount, and I ask the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment, on line 19, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted, and the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move to make the appropriation \$537,750.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York to the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In lieu of the \$400,000 proposed in the committee amendment, on line 19, page 70, the Senator from New York proposes to insert "\$537,750."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make a like request in reference to the amendment on line 21, that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on line 21 was agreed to. Without objection, that request is granted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the amendment be changed so as to read "\$517,648."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York proposes an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, on page 70, line 21, the Senator from New York proposes to insert the figures "\$517,648."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that the Secretary be authorized to correct the total, although I believe the total will be found to be the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be entered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am directed by the committee to propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 70, after line 12, the Senator from New York proposes to insert:

The appropriations herein made for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard" shall be available until December 31, 1926.

The unexpended balances of the appropriations for "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, are continued and made available until December 31, 1925.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not involve any increase of appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but will the Senator state how much was not used during the present year of the money which was appropriated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not hear the Senator's question.
Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator proposes the reappropriation of an unexpended balance?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not by this amendment. The amendment to which the Senator refers has already been adopted by the Senate. One million nine hundred thousand dollars, it is estimated, remains unexpended from the National Guard appropriation for the fiscal year 1924. One million seven

hundred and forty-three thousand dollars of that is reappropriated by this bill. This particular amendment merely has to do with the continuance of the availability of the appropriations in the future and in this current fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On the recommendation of the Committee on Military Affairs, not on the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations, I am instructed to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The READING CLERK. On page 25, after line 24, the Senator from New York proposes to insert:

Whenever, in the opinion of the President, the lands and improvements, or any portion of them, of the military post or reservation at Fort Porter, N. Y., are no longer necessary for military purposes, he may, in his discretion, cause to be appraised and sold in one or more parts that portion of such real property to which the United States holds a fee-simple title, under such regulations as to public notice and terms and conditions of sale as he may prescribe, and the proceeds to be deposited in the Treasury: *Provided*, That a sum of money, not exceeding the proceeds of such sale or sales, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, toward the construction of barracks and quarters or other buildings and utilities to accommodate a battalion of Infantry upon another Government-owned military post or reservation: *Provided further*, That the President is authorized to return to the State of New York such portions of the military post at Fort Porter that were originally donated by the State of New York when, in his opinion, such land is no longer needed for military purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator explain the amendment before it is voted on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Here is the situation: Fort Porter, a small Army post, with a capacity of approximately 400 men, is one of the old posts built, following the War of 1812, on what was then known as the frontier. It stands on the banks of the Niagara River at the city of Buffalo.

The city of Buffalo has expanded and grown solidly around the post. There are 28 acres in the reservation. There is no room for the training of troops at all. Eighteen acres belong to the State of New York, the State having turned it over to the Federal Government 80 or 90 years ago for military purposes, with the provision that should it ever be abandoned by the War Department it should revert to the State. Ten acres, approximately, are owned by the Government. There are barracks, officers' quarters, an old hospital building, and a few old storage buildings on the property.

The War Department would like to get rid of the post, because it is not suitable for the training of troops. There is not space enough. The department has been unable to get rid of it, however, in the past, because were it to be abandoned two-thirds of the acreage would revert to the State of New York as a matter of right resting in the State and all the Government's buildings would go with it. All the improvements made by the Government would be lost by the Government. So up to this point the Secretary of War has not been willing to abandon that post. The Government would lose whatever value the buildings would have. They are pretty old.

Now comes the city of Buffalo and by appropriate action of its common council instructs its finance officer to offer to the Secretary of War the sum of \$400,000 for this whole place, and that is the price fixed by the Secretary of War in negotiations with them. They offered to take this property off the hands of the War Department and pay \$400,000 for it and then deal with the State of New York in the matter of the title to the 18 acres.

The matter has reached a crisis for this reason: That a bridge is to be built across the Niagara River from Buffalo to the Canadian shore. It will be an immense structure, and it has been sadly needed for years, especially since the great increase in motor traffic. There is to-day no way of crossing but by means of a ferry.

The Army engineers have decreed that that bridge should be built at a certain specified height above the navigable channel of the Niagara River, 100 feet above the surface of the water at the navigable point. The only spot in Buffalo where an approach to such a bridge can be built is at Fort Porter itself, which happens to stand upon the highest point of a bluff extending along the river. It presents a crisis for the city. The building of the bridge will be a matter of immense importance, not only to Buffalo but to all that region of the country. The motor traffic is terrific. The history of

that bridge will be very much like the history already written in connection with the Bear Mountain Bridge, I may say to my colleague. This amendment will permit the building of the bridge, and will reimburse the Government a generous sum for the value of the post.

The Secretary of War says:

If I move these 400 men out of there, I have no place to put them, equipped as I am now with barracks and quarters.

So he asks us to let him build at some other military post now owned by the Government, out of money accruing from this sale, a set of barracks which will house the 400 men.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask my colleague to state to the Senate for the Record what progress has been made with the State of New York itself as regards the transfer of its share in this property to the city of Buffalo?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The progress this far made has been confined to informal negotiations between the officials of Buffalo and the officers of the company chartered to build the bridge and the officials at Albany, the State capital. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever but that the State legislature will cede to the city of Buffalo the right and title of the State of New York to this little plot of land.

Mr. COPELAND. No one speaks with greater authority about what the present Legislature of New York will do than does my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator from New York whether there was a unanimous report from the committee in reference to the Fort Porter matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood the Senator. In his first statement he said it was from the Committee on Military Affairs. From the Senator's statement it seems to me that is a matter which ought to be carried out, and I have no objection to it. I just wanted to be sure there was no difference of opinion in the committee.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope no one will oppose the amendment proposed by my colleague, for it makes for progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer the following amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The READING CLERK. On page 49, after line 23, the Senator from New York proposes to insert:

Hereafter the officer of the United States Engineer Corps in charge of public buildings and grounds shall, during the term of his office, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill about the amendment just offered. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is a matter which undoubtedly the Senator from Florida will recognize as soon as I utter a sentence or two about it. The Senator will remember that on several occasions the Committee on Military Affairs has had under discussion and consideration the military status and rank of that officer who is charged with the care of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FLETCHER. I recall now.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment which was passed over.

The READING CLERK. On page 83, line 9, after the word "cemeteries" to strike out "\$85,000" and down to and including the word "inventor" in line 12, and to insert "\$70,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe the Senator from Kentucky understands the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I suggest an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 20, after line 6, the Senator from Maine proposes to insert:

For the purchase of the tract of land adjoining the militia target range at Auburn, Me., comprising 84 acres, more or less, the property of John Baron, for the purpose of adding to said rifle range, not to exceed \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. I move an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas submits an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 103, after line 8, the Senator from Arkansas proposes to insert:

That the Secretary of War is authorized to make a final settlement of all the rights and obligations of the United States in respect of the picric-acid plant at Little Rock, Ark.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to offer two amendments, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the first amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The READING CLERK. On page 21, line 22, after the word "plants," strike out "for payment of entrance fees for Army rifle and pistol teams participating in competitions" and insert "for the payment of entrance fees of authorized participants of the Army in small-arms competitions."

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask if there is an appropriation provided in that amendment?

Mr. BROOKHART. There is no change in the appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It provides an authorization for the use of money already appropriated?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The READING CLERK. On page 22, line 2, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That expenditures heretofore made from, and obligations incurred against, appropriations for incidental expenses of the Army for entrance fees of authorized participants of the Army in small-arms competitions are hereby authorized and validated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 87, after line 20, insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase when purchasable at prices deemed by him reasonable, or otherwise by condemnation under the procedure prescribed by the laws of Tennessee, such tracts of land as are deemed by him necessary and desirable for suitable designation of the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn., and to obtain and place on said tracts appropriate markers: *Provided*, That the entire cost of acquiring and marking said tracts, including cost of condemnation proceedings, if any, ascertainment of title, surveys, and compensation for the land, shall not exceed the sum of \$20,000. And the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended for the purposes of this act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not make a point of order against the amendment. The Battle of Franklin in the State of Tennessee was one of the bloodiest battles of the Civil War. As I recall, there were something like 10,000 soldiers killed there in the course of two or three hours. It was really one of the bloodiest of the Civil War battles. The markers are fast disappearing, and unless an appropriation is made to provide markers for the battle field while people are now living who can indicate the ground on which the battle was fought, it will pass out of existence as a battle field. I hope the chairman of the committee will not make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I would like to help my friend in that kind of legislation, but the amendment certainly could not be put on a bill like this without opening the door for all kinds of legislation on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. An amendment very similar just went on the bill. It was proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. There is no possible difference between the amend-

ments except that one is for Maine and the other is for Tennessee.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, there is a wide difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a wide difference between Maine and Tennessee of course, but I am talking about placing the two amendments on the bill. There is no possible difference between them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine is the text of a bill reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs after thorough consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will report this one, too.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps later on we will. We shall give it our best consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. The amendment does not propose to create a national park?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. FLETCHER. It simply provides for markers and that is the end of it. There is no further expense upon the Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. The expense is only \$20,000 and it is all appropriated here. I ask the Senator from New York if he will not let it go in and be taken up in conference?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would not have any right to do that. I shall have to make the point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will introduce the amendment as a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received.

Mr. McKELLAR introduced a bill (S. 4069) relative to the acquirement of the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York what is the aggregate amount carried in the War Department appropriation bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill as reported to the Senate carried \$332,352,671. On the floor of the Senate there has been added \$3,000 by reason of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. If the bill becomes a law in its present form there will be appropriated about \$5,327,600 less than the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator what proportion of the entire amount is legitimately chargeable to war machinery, the War Department, because the bill as I understand it carries a number of measures that are scarcely germane to the subject of war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; a large number.

Mr. WARREN. It carries a large part of the old sundry civil list.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For example, it carries a rivers and harbors item which is \$40,000,000. It carries \$10,000,000 for Mississippi River flood control. It carries \$3,000,000 for continuation of work at Muscle Shoals, \$7,500,000 for the support of the National Soldiers' Home, \$8,700,000 for the Panama Canal Zone, and all of the care of the national cemeteries and national military parks aggregating some millions of dollars. I should say \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000 in the bill are for non-military activities.

Mr. KING. I would like to inquire of the Senator whether the \$40,000,000 referred to for river and harbor work is to cover any new projects?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all.

Mr. KING. It is to continue existing river and harbor projects?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; for maintenance and construction of projects already adopted and authorized by the Congress.

Mr. KING. Will there be a river and harbor bill this session?

Mr. WADSWORTH. An appropriation bill?

Mr. KING. Yes; for rivers and harbors.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may only give my personal view. I think not.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think the \$40,000,000 will cover the appropriations for the current year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There may be an authorization for new projects. That matter is now pending before the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to be inserted on page 91, after line 12, in connection with the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers, buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 91, after line 17, insert the following:

The Chief of Engineers or the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds is hereby authorized to remove any obstructions in the public highways in the District of Columbia which are a menace to life.

Mr. KING. Ought not that to be incorporated as proper legislation upon the District appropriation bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will have to raise the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. I suspected the Senator would do so, but I hope he will permit me to make a statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I withhold the point of order for that purpose.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator will remember it when the District of Columbia appropriation bill comes up. It might answer there as a direction under some appropriation.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall remember that.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that we will have a District appropriation bill before us which covers all such items, providing for the streets, highways, and so forth. Of course, the District funds should be charged with the expense of putting the streets in order. It ought not to be tacked on a War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will permit me to make a brief statement, I think he will see the reason why I am offering it here. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] are perfectly familiar with the matter. Early in the administration of the late President Harding he expressed a desire to have the massive iron gates on West Executive Avenue removed, he believing that they were a menace to health and an impediment to public traffic.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. That very matter has received attention at the hands of the District Committee, of which I am a member. We have not finally decided upon it. As I now recall, there is a bill now pending before us which, if passed, would effect the object the Senator has in view.

Mr. WILLIS. I hope the Senator's committee will report the bill favorably, because I have grave fears that the point of order may be made against the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator had better appear before our committee, because some of us are not satisfied that that magnificent gate should be removed; but the persuasive eloquence of his power may lead us to change our views.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that as a member of the District Committee I shall be very glad to advocate the bill he has in mind. I think it is a wise proposal and should be carried out.

Mr. WILLIS. I am gratified at the progress I have made. If I could have a similar assurance from the distinguished Member of the Senate who now occupies the chair as presiding officer that I should have his support, I should feel almost inclined to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he is rather inclined against the proposition of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. That greatly discourages me, and I therefore feel constrained to offer the amendment at this time.

Seriously, may I briefly explain just what is sought here? President Harding was very anxious that those gates should be removed, it being his belief that they were a menace to the convenience and even to the life of the traveling public. He had the further desire to comply with the request of Col. Webb Hayes, a son of the late President Hayes, who very patriotically and with filial devotion has dedicated his great estate at Fremont, Ohio, as a perpetual memorial to his father and mother for the use of the public. He has beautified Spiegel Grove in every possible way, has erected an historical museum, and has a number of historical gateways and entrances to the grounds at Spiegel Grove. It was desired that those gates should be dedicated to that purpose, and thought was directed to it because of the fact that an effort was made at one time to sell the gates, and it was found that not only was there no bid for them but that the best offer they could get was from some contractor who was willing to take them away for \$2,000. The proposition was that the gates should be given to the Spiegel Grove estate, but that they should be removed without expense to the Government. That is what is sought in the amendment to authorize the removal of those gates.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I am very sorry the Senator from Ohio has made his speech, because now that he tells me the gates are going to Ohio, I am not sure but what I shall have to oppose the matter in the committee, because if they go to any State they should go to the State of New York.

Mr. WILLIS. We will argue that with the Senator when we get before his committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question about the Panama Canal Zone. What amount of money is carried in the bill for administration there? I understood the chairman in his repetition of what the bill contained to mention that item, but I can not find it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The total for the Panama Canal is \$8,735,366.

Mr. FESS. The revenue collected at the canal goes into the general Treasury, does it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. FESS. Does the chairman of the committee have the report of collections for the year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not.

Mr. FESS. I had understood there was something like \$24,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is gross revenue.

Mr. FESS. That would indicate that it is coming to be somewhat a paying project.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is self-supporting. I have not the figures before me. It certainly is paying its running expenses. Whether it is paying in addition to that the interest upon the Panama bonds I am not informed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business may again be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the unfinished business having been laid before the Senate, because of the absence of several Senators who desire to submit amendments to amendments which have been proposed by the committee to the bill, I shall not ask to go forward with the measure this afternoon.

MINERAL LANDS IN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 876) to provide for the disposition of bonuses, rentals, and royalties received under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, from unallotted lands in Executive order Indian reservations, and for other purposes.

I will state that in looking over the bill and the House amendment which was concurred in by the Senate on yesterday, it was discovered that there were three words left out. The department has just called my attention to the matter. I therefore move a reconsideration of the vote by which the House amendment was concurred in.

Mr. KING. Are the omitted words important to the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all, but they were simply omitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the bill to which the senior Senator from Utah refers has already gone to the House of Representatives. His motion will therefore have to be accompanied by a request for a return of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask that the bill may be returned from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill to which he refers. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider will be entered and be acted upon after the bill to which it relates shall have been returned to the Senate.

ISLE OF PINES TREATY

Mr. MOSES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Isle of Pines treaty in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, in open executive session and as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty between the United States and Cuba, signed March 2, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a few minutes. I wish to read into the RECORD, continuing very briefly the discussion on the pending treaty, three articles from the Paris treaty of peace with Spain:

ARTICLE I. Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the Island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation for the protection of life and property.

ART. II. Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies and the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrones.

ART. III. Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands. * * *

Mr. President, if there were any doubt as to the relation of the Isle of Pines to Cuba and that the Isle of Pines is a part of Cuba, there never would have been any discussion of this subject. The Platt amendment created the issue. Article 6 of that amendment reads:

The Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left for future adjustment by treaty.

On November 10, 1903, President Roosevelt submitted for the advice and consent of the Senate as to its ratification a treaty between the United States and Cuba, signed on July 2, 1903, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines. Article IV of that treaty provided that it must be ratified "within seven months."

The treaty was not ratified, and on March 2, 1904, a second treaty was signed and sent to the Senate for its consideration. That is the treaty which is now pending.

It seems to be the impression of many Senators that there is no difference in the wording of the two treaties, except the clause providing for ratification within seven months, as used in the first treaty and omitted in the second.

An interesting situation has developed. The State Department has failed to find the original of the first treaty, signed on July 2, 1903. In consequence we must depend for guidance on the papers which are on file in the Senate. Concerning this matter I will speak in a moment.

I have been shown by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] what appears to be a copy of the original treaty, and it does not harmonize in language with the papers on file in the Senate. It is extremely unfortunate that any doubt exists as to the wording of the first treaty.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has failed to state that the copy of the treaty which I exhibited to him is a copy of the treaty said to have been filed with the Department of State of Cuba, and the document which I exhibited to the Senator has attached to it the certificate of the President of Cuba to the effect, as I understand, that it is a correct copy of the original treaty on file in the office of the secretary of state of that country.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the matter is exactly as stated by the Senator from North Carolina. What we have appears to be a certified copy of the original treaty; but it is not the original treaty, and the language does not coincide with the language contained in the treaty presented to the Senate at the time the Senate was asked to ratify the first treaty. One purpose I have in mind to-day in addressing the Senate is to broadcast the information that the American copy of the treaty is lost, hoping that this knowledge may stimulate search by all officials concerned. The original treaty is tucked away in a pigeonhole somewhere, and it should be brought to light for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. The treaty that was certified by the State Department is a copy and is not the original. It is a typewritten copy of the treaty transmitted by President Roosevelt in a communication in his own handwriting. It seems at that time it was customary to send copies of treaties to the Senate, and not to send the original treaties. Since then original treaties have been sent to the Senate for ratification. I have not been able to find the original Isle of Pines treaty. I secured the copy that was sent with President Roosevelt's message to the Senate, which, as I have said, was a typewritten copy, with the signatures of the American representative and the Cuban representative, who negotiated it also in typewriting. The original treaty must be somewhere among the papers in the State Department, but the officials have not been able to find it there. I repeat, I think that now the Senate receives the original treaty upon which it acts, but at one time it was the custom merely to send copies here, and the Senate acted on the copies. The usual course now pursued is to send the original treaty here. That seems to be the proper course, and when the treaty is ratified the original is sent back, together with the resolution of ratification by the Senate, which is filed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator from Virginia a question.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. When the method of procedure to which the Senator from Virginia has just referred was in force—that is, the sending of copies instead of the originals—was the copy always certified to as being a correct copy?

Mr. SWANSON. It was so certified, and President Roosevelt sent it with a message to the Senate. I was the first person to call attention to the discrepancy. When I made that statement the minister from Cuba called my attention to the fact that the original in Habana was precisely similar to the second treaty. When the second treaty was sent here it purported practically to be, and representations were made that it was, the same as the first treaty, except that there was no limitation on the period within which ratification might be made. The only differences between the two are that in the first treaty the United States relinquishes its right to the Isle of Pines under Article II, and also the expression "Porto Rico and other islands under Spanish sovereignty" is used.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator would hardly place emphasis on that and say "the only difference." That is a very significant difference, is it not?

Mr. SWANSON. In the second treaty it is said "all rights acquired under Article II." I think there is no substantial difference between the two, because under Article I it has never been claimed that the United States acquired any right, as it was simply a relinquishment of a right by Spain, which would go to the people of Cuba, whom we declared to be free, sovereign, and independent. All the claim that was ever made to any right on the part of the United States was under Article II of the treaty, which conveys to the United States Porto Rico and other islands under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies. I have never thought it was material to show any title under Article I, which is a relinquishment clause entirely.

I have made every effort I could in every direction of which I could think to find the original treaty that was signed by the representatives of the two countries, but it has not been found. However, there can not be any question as to the validity of the original, wherever it may be, which carries the signature of Squires for the United States, and of Montes, who, I think, was the Spanish representative who signed that treaty.

I modified my views and accepted the statement of the Cuban ambassador that he had an exact copy, which was so certified. I have tried to verify it in every way that I could and to get the original, which is deposited somewhere. However, I am not able to see any difference as to the material rights of the United States, as it has always been claimed that our rights were acquired under Article II.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, I shall try to convert the Senator from Virginia on that particular matter; but in the meantime I thank the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say that while I entirely concur in the views as stated by the Senator from Virginia—and I do not think it is very material, because I agree with him that whatever claim the United States has must grow out of Article II and not out of Article I; but as a matter of history, when the question was raised, I was very

anxious to ascertain whether a mistake had actually been made in what purported to be the copy sent to the Senate and from which the treaty as we find it in these documents was printed. For that reason I, having met some of the representatives of the Cuban embassy here, inquired of them if they had the original, and was told that they did have it and would let me see it. When it came I thought it was the original and then paid no attention to it, but upon closer investigation, in company with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON], I discovered that it only purported to be a copy of the treaty which was certified as a correct copy, as I understand. The certificate was in Spanish, and I have not had it interpreted, but I understood it was a certificate that the copy was a correct copy of the original treaty on file in Cuba.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. The original treaties would not be delivered to anyone. We could only get certified copies.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I thought. I had supposed that where there was a treaty, each party to the treaty had the original in duplicate.

Mr. SWANSON. They have the original in duplicate. I think it was both in Spanish and in English, and the original ought to have been sent to the Senate. When ratified by the Senate, the resolution of ratification ought to have accompanied it, and it ought to have been deposited in the State Department. They have sent a copy here. Nobody can get the original. If it is in the State Department, they might let us see it, but it is in the custody of the man who has the seal of state.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I understand the Senator to say that the original can not be found.

Mr. SWANSON. It can not be found in the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. But can it be found in the State Department?

Mr. SWANSON. I have not had a sufficient search made up there for it to enable me to say.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the Senator from New York had search made for it?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], at my request has had every possible search made at the State Department for this original treaty, and it can not be found. It is because of this, Mr. President, that I am addressing the Senate this afternoon. I want to broadcast the fact that this treaty has been mislaid. Somebody, somewhere, has it, and I hope that as a result of this discussion the right person will be aroused to bring it to the Senate, so that we may know what the language is; because, frankly, Mr. President, it makes a great difference in my mind whether Article I in the first treaty says that we acquired the Isle of Pines under Article I, or Articles I and II, or Article II. Of course, however, I am going to go into that later, and in the meanwhile I will go on with my discussion of this matter.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator, if it develops that the treaties are similar, and Article I and Article II are included in both treaties, whether he will think it is conclusive that the United States did not possess the island?

Mr. COPELAND. I should then fall back on the speech which I made a few days ago, in which, without knowing that this problem existed, I proved conclusively to my own satisfaction that it does not make any difference whether it is I, or I and II, or II.

Mr. SWANSON. I feel the same way. I am sure it is a very immaterial matter. Everybody recognizes that if the United States has any title it is under Article II; and whether it relinquishes rights which it did not have under Article I or Article II, it really goes to the basis as to whether the Isle of Pines was included in the phrase "other islands in the West Indies."

Mr. COPELAND. Of course.

Mr. President, while we are waiting for the determination of this question and for a glimpse of the original treaty, I desire, for the benefit of interested Senators, to call attention to the radical difference between Article I of the first treaty, the one which lapsed, and Article I of the pending treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in parallel columns, so that the difference may be noted.

I ask unanimous consent, also, that Articles I and II and the first three lines of Article III of the treaty of Paris be printed in the same section of the RECORD, and that these quotations from the treaty shall include both the English and the Spanish versions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TREATY OF PEACE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SPAIN OF DECEMBER 10, 1898

ARTICLE I

Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

ARTICLE II

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, and the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrões.

ARTICLE III

Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands.

ARTÍCULO I

España renuncia todo derecho de soberanía y propiedad sobre Cuba.

En atención a que dicha isla, cuando sea evacuada por España, va a ser ocupada por los Estados Unidos, los Estados Unidos mientras dure su ocupación, tomarán sobre sí y cumplirán las obligaciones que por el hecho de ocuparla, les impone el Derecho Internacional, para la protección de vidas y haciendas.

ARTÍCULO II

España cede a los Estados Unidos la Isla de Puerto Rico y las demás que están ahora bajo su soberanía en las Indias Occidentales, y la Isla de Guam en el Archipiélago de las Marianas ó Ladrões.

ARTÍCULO III

España cede a los Estados Unidos el archipiélago conocido por las Islas Filipinas.

TREATIES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CUBA

Treaty of July 2, 1903

(First treaty)

ARTICLE I

The United States of America relinquishes in favor of the Republic of Cuba all claim of title to the Island of Pines situate in the Caribbean Sea near the southwestern part of the island of Cuba, which has been and may be made in virtue of Article II of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, signed in the city of Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Treaty of March 2, 1904

(Pending treaty)

ARTICLE I

The United States of America relinquishes in favor of the Republic of Cuba all claim of title to the Island of Pines situate in the Caribbean Sea near the southwestern part of the island of Cuba, which has been and may be made in virtue of Articles I and II of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. COPELAND. I have made the requests relating to the treaty with Spain in order that I may call attention later to certain inaccuracies in the translation. On another occasion, too, I shall point out the distinction made in the treaty between the word "island," as used with reference to Cuba, and the word "archipelago" when referring to the Philippine Islands.

The proponents of the treaty found their arguments on the theory that the Isle of Pines is and always has been a part of Cuba, and that Cuba's claim to the island lies in Article I of the Paris treaty.

Even if this contention were established, it is clear as day to me that Cuba has no legal or moral claim to the Isle of Pines, except so far as it was given by the Platt amendment. Should it develop that Cuba is depending for possession on Article II of the Paris treaty, in spite of what the Senator from Virginia said a little while ago, even the most enthusiastic supporters of the pending treaty must be forced to admit that the claim is without substantial foundation. I am sorry that the Senator from Virginia has left the Chamber, because this would be a good time to discuss that question, perhaps.

It should be noted by Senators that according to available records the first treaty, which must have reflected the prevailing Cuban and American sentiment, was founded on the theory that the Isle of Pines, just as was Porto Rico, was ceded to us by Article II of the Paris treaty. If the papers on

file in the Senate are correct, there is left not a vestige of doubt that the Isle of Pines was ceded to the United States with Porto Rico and the other Spanish islands in the West Indies as indemnity for our losses incurred in the war with Spain.

The history of the first treaty in the Senate, as shown by the papers on file in the executive clerk's office, is as follows:

This, Mr. President, is the paper which was sent to the Senate, supposed to be the first treaty; and I want to write into the record the history of this treaty as recorded upon this paper:

November 11, 1903. Treaty read the first time and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, together with the message and accompanying papers, ordered to be printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.

November 23, 1903, reported.

November 24, 1903, injunction of secrecy removed.

February 1, 1904, recommitted.

And then the note:

Expired by limitation.

This note, "Expired by limitation," is the last known action, and dates back a period of almost 21 years. It is possible, of course, that the papers transmitted to the Senate were not accurate in their quotation of the language of the treaty; but I submit that 21 years is a long time to pass before this point is raised. When the original treaty is found, if it is still in existence, it may not harmonize with the language of the papers on file; but at this moment the burden of proof is on those who contend that Article I of the pending treaty is identical with Article I of the first treaty. The record, both in the Senate file and in the State Department, is to the contrary.

In any event, as I see it, the Isle of Pines was ceded to the United States by Article II of the treaty, and it was not intended by the commissioners to treat the Isle of Pines in any other way than Porto Rico or the other islands included in Article II were treated.

It is unfortunate that the original treaty can not be found for the moment. This impels me, Mr. President, as in legislative session, to present the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York, as in legislative session, offers a resolution which will be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 315), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to obtain from the Cuban Government, for the information of the Senate, an authenticated copy of the English and Spanish texts of the treaty signed between the United States and Cuba on July 2, 1903, for the adjustment of the title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines, the United States' original being misplaced and not available for the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 22), 1925

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Capt. John L. Doxey to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of July, 1924.

First Lieut. Alton A. Gladden to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of June, 1924.

First Lieut. Dudley S. Brown to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of July, 1924.

Second Lieut. Otto B. Osmondson to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of May, 1923.

Second Lieut. Joseph L. Moody to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of January, 1924.

Second Lieut. Walter A. Wachtler to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of August, 1924.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, January 24, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, when we consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon, the stars which Thou hast ordained, what is man that Thou art mindful of him? Truly, we are the perpetual miracle of Thy love! We would speak of Thy loving kindness and call it marvelous and of Thy tender mercies and regard them as without number. Build us up, O Lord, in a most holy faith and give us to feel that we are building our life house upon the eternal rocks. Do Thou give us triumph over all fear. Show us that in this world we are in preparation for better things. Give us a little realization of that peace and joy which are to come, because of Him who became obedient to Calvary's cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 369. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913; and

S. 876. An act to provide for the disposition of bonuses, rentals, and royalties received under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, from unallotted lands in Executive order Indian reservations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 11168) granting the consent of Congress to S. M. McAdams, of Iva, Anderson County, S. C., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 5417. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Mo., commemorative of the Battle of Westport, October 23, 1864;

H. R. 10947. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Monongahela River in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3722. An act to authorize the county of Knox, State of Indiana, and the county of Lawrence, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind.; and

S. 3884. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Independence, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the White River at or near the city of Batesville, in the county of Independence, in the State of Arkansas.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. Smoot and Mr. Simmons members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3722. An act to authorize the county of Knox, State of Indiana, and the county of Lawrence, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3884. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Independence, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the White River at or near the city of

Batesville, in the county of Independence, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 23, 1925, they presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 4168. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. 670).

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was presented by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

RETURN OF DOMESTIC ANIMALS WHICH HAVE CROSSED THE BOUNDARY LINE

Mr. GARNER of Texas, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, presented a privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means to accompany House Joint Resolution 325, extending the time during which certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line may be returned duty free, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

SPEECH OF HON. PEDRO GUEVARA, PHILIPPINE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief but most interesting address which will be delivered by our colleague, Mr. GUEVARA, Commissioner from the Philippines, in Boston to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a speech delivered by Hon. PEDRO GUEVARA, Philippine Resident Commissioner, before the members of the Foreign Policy Association of Boston January 24, 1925, which is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, an opportunity like this by which the people of the Philippine Islands can lay bare, before the bar of American public opinion, their case for the solution of which they have been striving for a long time, has been very seldom extended to them. I am, therefore, deeply grateful to the Foreign Policy Association of Boston for this opportunity given to me, and I wish to convey to its members my thanks.

A discussion of the Philippine questions from several points of view is essential as well as beneficial to all concerned. It will show at least whether or not the American occupation of the Philippines has been of service to humanity, to civilization, and progress. It will, also, show whether or not the American people of the present day are following the path traced by their ancestors. A careful examination of the events and accomplishments in the Philippine Islands during the American sovereignty, will supply the most scrupulous historian plenty of materials to write a glorious chapter on the service of the United States of America to humanity. Let biased critics minimize the task accomplished by the United States in the Philippines and the progress attained by the Filipino people in the last 25 years. The time which is cruel in its judgment will duly honor the blessings brought by the American flag in that far country and the intelligent and patriotic response of the Filipino people in taking advantage of the chances given to them.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Gentlemen, as a preliminary to the discussion of facts and conditions in the Philippines, it will not be out of place to give the members of the Foreign Policy Association of Boston a brief description of the country and its people. The Philippine Islands are situated to the southeast of Asia bounded by the Pacific Ocean on the north and east, by the Celebes Sea on the south, and by the China Sea on the west. They are 631 nautical miles from the nearest port of China and from the nearest port of Japan the Philippine Islands are 1,306 nautical miles. The total area of the islands is 115,026 square miles, or in excess of the combined areas of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware; and those of the independent states of Greece, Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and almost as big as the entire area of Great Britain. There are over 11,000,000 people or 4,000,000 more than the total population of the New England States; and 4,000,000 more than the combined population of the Pacific States, and in excess of the populations of the independent states of Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Belgium, Greece, Austria, Hungary, Netherlands, Peru, and others.

The Filipinos are a homogeneous people and speak about 17 different dialects which can properly be reduced to only five which are quite different from each other. But inhabitants of the different regions, with different dialects, can communicate with each other understandingly in the very dialects they speak or in the English or Spanish languages which are the official languages. A similar condition prevails in Spain, Switzerland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, not to mention China.

PROGRESS ACCOMPLISHED BY THE FILIPINOS

The Filipinos are the only Christian people in the Orient, 92 per cent of the 11,000,000 belonging to the Christian religion and the 8 per cent are either Mohammedan, Buddhist, or Pagans. The Filipinos have been under the influence of the Christian religion for over 300 years.

With respect to the progress accomplished during the last few years, let me just cite a few pertinent figures.

The public-school enrollment for the academic year 1922-23 was 1,102,322, besides the enrollment in the private schools. In these enrollments are not included the university and colleges which run to several thousands. Due to the efficient system of public instruction in the Philippines, established during the American sovereignty, the percentage of literacy is over 60 per cent, which is above those of 35 independent nations and below only 14 nations.

The sanitary progress accomplished during the American sovereignty is really a wonder. From 1908 to 1913 the death rate was 32 per thousand, while from 1914 to 1919 it was 28.62 per thousand, showing a decrease of over 4 per thousand in a period of five years. Since the last date more hospitals and social-welfare institutions were established and the mortality per thousand has further decreased very considerably. If we examine now the improvements in the way of public works, highways, and public buildings constructed in the different municipalities in the last 10 years, it will occasion surprise that the Filipinos have made such progress under the circumstances. Figures may be had from our official archives which will demonstrate unparalleled advance in business and industry; in administration and other government activities. And there is the testimony of public officials—Filipinos and Americans—who have been connected with our governmental affairs.

The problem of picturing the true Philippine conditions seems to be a very hard one. If you happen to have read the articles published in the different papers of this country entitled the "Isles of Fear," by Miss Mayo, it must have amazed you that in spite of over 25 years of American sovereignty in the Philippines that country is still in almost a savage state and no progress at all has been accomplished. If that is the situation, either the sovereign power or the people of the islands are responsible. In either case the indictment is really directed against the Government of the United States. If the sovereign power has not accomplished something for the welfare and progress of the people placed under its guidance in a period of 25 years, then it can not escape accountability for the failure. On the other hand, if the people are naturally and hopelessly incapable for progress or improvement, then there is no justification for the sacrifices and expenditures which may attach to the continuance of the Government's effort. It would be better to renounce the task voluntarily undertaken and let the people work out their own salvation and learn from the lessons of their own experience, as the American people did in the past. It must be taken into consideration that the Philippine Islands have been under the administration of several American officials belonging to the two great political parties of the United States, and if notwithstanding this fact no progress has been accomplished and the political concessions given to the people are not justified, then it may be well said that the 26 years of the American occupation of the Philippines has been a reckless waste of time.

FREEDOM IS THE ROOT OF PROGRESS

In some sections of the public opinion of this country there is advocated the adoption of a political backward step, or at least there is definite opposition to any further liberal concessions to the Filipino people in the line of self-government. Some are still going further than this in that they advocate that a most autocratic policy be adopted, because, according to the author of the "Isles of Fear," the people of the islands have "no sense of morals and honor," a statement hardly deserving comment.

In passing, however, let me remind you that the American people in the beginning of their independent existence were aspersed by certain French critics as a "degraded people" with "a spirit of fear and sense of inferiority," language which closely resembles that used by Miss Mayo. Think of the situation in the colonial period in America even as contrasted with the present Philippine situation as pictured by those who see the worst side of it. Think of what their critics said of the first settlers of Virginia under the charter of the London Co. in 1609. The colonists were so idle as to compel John Smith, who was at the head, to establish the rule "he who will not work shall not eat." Notwithstanding very little progress was made and the "starving times" came when the colonists were forced to live "by roots, herbs,

acorns, walnuts, berries, and even the very skins of their horses." The loss of life was so terrible that out of the first 1,000 settlers less than 100 survived to tell of their troubles. In the midst of this terrible condition John Smith left the country and Sir Thomas Dale as his successor ruled with a rod of iron. He enforced Smith's decree by whipping those who would not work. But that policy accomplished little, and through the efforts of Sir Edwin Sandys and other liberal members of the London Co. the people of Virginia were at last given a share in their own Government. As stated by an American historian, "the cruel and tyrannical rule of one man like Dale was no longer possible, for the Government was more nearly by the people and for the people," and since then there has been marvelous progress not only in Virginia but in the other original Colonies and in the new States culminating in the unparalleled position now enjoyed by the United States. This page of the American history shows the unfading truth that freedom is the root of progress. And American history is paralleled by that of other nations.

MISREPRESENTATION ONLY BREEDS HATE

Biased critics, and especially the author of the "Isles of Fear," contesting the capacity of the Filipino people for self-government, cite the economic and financial conditions prevailing in the islands during the administration of Gov. Francis Burton Harrison. They do great injustice both to Governor Harrison and to the people. Without embarking upon any partisan discussion, let me say that the administration of Governor Harrison brought happiness and contentment to the inhabitants of the islands. It is only fair to say that Governor Harrison, following the mandate of the Government of the United States, gave the Filipinos such complete control of their own domestic affairs as the organic law permitted, and if there was failure it was not his fault, but theirs. But there was no failure. History will give a full account of the success of his administration, and the time will come that everybody will approve it as one of the most brilliant during the occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States.

I do not wish, however, to ignore the splendid work done in the islands by other American Governors General. Not to mention all of them, I wish to pay my tribute to the administration of Governor Forbes, a distinguished son of Boston, whose genius brought us prosperity. He laid the foundation upon which to build up the economic progress of the country, and, among other things, provided a wonderful system of highways. What he commenced has been kept up and developed. It is true that his opinion regarding our ultimate fate differs from that of the Filipinos themselves, but he is honest and sincere in his ideas, and we know that individual opinion can not impair the soundness and vitality of American ideals and traditions.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, loyalty and good faith have caused me to assume in behalf of my people full responsibility for what was or was not done during the administration of Governor Harrison. You have frequently heard one side of the question discussed by our unmerciful critics. We have read and heard with patience such criticism, however extravagant and cruel. Some writers have painted our people in such a way as to hurt their natural pride, as well as excite prejudice against them, but the Filipinos have learned sportsmanship in politics. They know they have their own defects and virtues as any other people of whatever race. No people or race has yet reached the perfection dreamed by the apostles of human welfare. Heaven is yet beyond their reach.

Misrepresentation does not surprise us. We know that it is an unavoidable incident in all struggles for freedom. The American people have suffered in the same way. In the heat of the struggle of your forefathers for the liberation of this country they were pilloried by their enemies as common "individuals" who could not "dignify" themselves by any "title" they might adopt, who were appealing to "passion" and not to the "reason" of the British nation. They were branded as "selfish men who hope to derive private emolument from public calamities." They were charged with violating "private confidence," even stealing "letters and documents" so as to successfully shackle the press and gag their opponents. In the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, that immortal charter of liberty, they were accused of "willfully or ignorantly" distorting the facts and deducing arguments from "premises that have no foundation in truth," to use the language of that great document.

The Filipinos do not resent constructive criticism. They welcome it. Thus they can appreciate the errors that should be corrected. But gross misstatement is not real criticism. It is destructive, very destructive. It does not foster friendship, but destroys it. It turns friends into foemen. It breeds nothing but hate.

Let me say, ladies and gentlemen, that the economic troubles which have occurred in the Philippines are similar to those which visited all the countries of the world after the war. No nation has escaped it. The United States, in spite of its marvelous strength and prestige, suffered in that unavoidable crisis. Many banks closed their doors and many financial enterprises suspended.

At this point let me quote what Mr. Otto C. Leightner has said in his "The history of business depression," as to the effect of the universal depression upon the financial and industrial institutions of this country. He says:

"After the depression set in in 1920, and including the first three-quarters of 1921, failures numbered 6,503 * * * involving \$202,532,000, August, 1921, showing the greatest number of defaults, a total of 1,562. * * * Altogether 17,000 concerns, large and small, were forced to go out of business in 1920 and 1921, and a large number of others no doubt suffered enormous losses."

But for the sake of argument let it be supposed that such a condition was confined to the Philippines alone. "Common sense," which is the slogan of the day, teaches that it can not be regarded as proof that our people are incapable of self-government, for panics also occurred in this country. Those of 1837 and 1857 are too recent to be forgotten, and instead of discouraging the American people they marked stages in the development of the Nation. And may we not claim that just as the United States was not finally condemned because of the serious reverses which took place here, so our people can not be finally condemned because they have suffered like reverses?

There is a loud cry on the part of the critics of the Filipinos regarding alleged corruptions and dishonesty of some of our political leaders. The charge may be true, although it is greatly magnified. As bearing upon that general subject I wish to repeat what President Coolidge said in his address of acceptance delivered at Washington, D. C., on August 14, 1924:

"In all my studies of political history I can not recall an administration which was desirous of a dishonest and corrupt Government. * * * But individuals charged with wrongdoing are being prosecuted. * * *

"Whenever there have been suspicions of guilt involving members of any party I have caused them to be investigated and presentation made to the grand jury. If the evidence warranted, those suspected of crime have been indicted, and without favor, but without malice, they will be tried on the charge returned against them. Wherever it has appeared that the property of the Government has been illegally transferred and held action has been brought for its recovery and will be pursued to a final judgment. No government was ever able to prevent altogether the commission of crime."

UNITED STATES CONSISTENTLY SHUNS FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENTS

Permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to examine now very briefly the stand of the United States in regard to her foreign policy since the days of George Washington up to the present time. In the farewell address of Washington it was said that "the great rule of conduct" for the United States "in regard to foreign nations is * * * to have with them as little political connections as possible," and that it would be unwise for the United States to implicate herself by "artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes" of the Old World policies. Washington said also that the distant situation of the United States invites and enables her to pursue a different course than that followed by the Old World.

It is true that when Washington was enunciating these principles he was only referring to the Old World or European powers, but the spirit and wisdom of these principles are still applicable to the present position of the United States in relation to Asia and the Far East, as has been explicitly recognized.

Twenty-five years afterwards, in 1823, the Monroe doctrine was proclaimed by the United States to the world. Chief Justice Marshall, once Secretary of State during the administration of President Adams, said:

"No principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations. It results from the equality that no one can rightfully impose a rule upon another and that every nation has the right to independence in the sense that it has a right to the pursuit of happiness and is free to develop itself without interference or control from other states, provided that in so doing it does not interfere with or violate the rights of other states."

For a century the United States has acted on these principles of foreign policy. It has been invariably consistent in its conduct, as evidenced by the recent declaration of President Coolidge in his message to Congress on December 3, 1924:

"* * * Our actions—

The President said—

"in the recent months have greatly strengthened the American policy of permanent peace with independence. * * * Ultimately nations, like individuals, can not depend upon each other but must depend upon themselves. Each one must work out its own salvation. * * * Our past adherence to this policy, our constant refusal to maintain a military establishment that could be thought to menace the security of others, our honorable dealings with other nations, whether great or small, has left us in the almost constant enjoyment of peace. * * * While we desire always to cooperate and to help, we are equally determined to be independent and free. Right and truth and justice and humanitarian efforts will have the moral support of this country all over the world. * * *

UNITED STATES, THE CHAMPION OF SMALL NATIONS

The United States has enforced its traditional policy. In 1866 France withdrew from Mexico upon intimidation by the United States. In 1902 Great Britain, Germany, and Italy withdrew their demonstration against Venezuela because of the attention of the United States. This Nation was largely responsible for the preservation of the territorial integrity of China. She recognized the independence of Cuba as the fruit of the American victory against Spain.

Many small nations in Europe are now enjoying an independent life through the influence of the principle of "self-determination" proclaimed by the United States during the World War. This humanitarian principle has invigorated the spirit of the small nations and has ended the dreams of conquest entertained by strong nations.

In the light of all this, it is evident that the philosophy of the foreign policy of the United States was and is not to hamper the national development of the people of any country but allow them to work out their own destiny.

PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT IS SELF-SUPPORTING

It has been suggested that the present financial condition of the islands forbids an independent life. I answer by saying that the cost of our government has never exceeded the islands' revenues. And in this connection I wish to refer to the policy of the United States relative to some of the bankrupt nations of Europe.

In the debate in the House of Representatives of the United States December 16, 1924, on the bill "to authorize the settlement of indebtedness of the Republic of Poland to the United States of America, and for other purposes," Congressman CRISP said:

" * * * The bill you are now called upon to consider, settling the indebtedness of Poland, is substantially the same; it in no material way varies and does not lose the United States 1 cent over what it is receiving under the British settlement. The only difference is that for the first five years Poland is required to pay only \$10,000,000 in cash. Under the terms of the agreement the remainder of principal and interest due during those five years in excess of \$10,000,000 can be paid in bonds of Poland. Poland is a new republic and weak financially. Since the armistice she has been engaged in war; Poland's economic condition is bad, her revenue does not meet her expenditures, and she is a young, struggling republic. * * *"

In the same financial plight as that of Poland are found Armenia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Rumania, Yugoslavia. And there can not be excluded the great nations of Germany, Russia, Italy, Great Britain, and France, who owe the United States billions and billions of dollars without being able to make immediate payment or in most cases offer terms of settlement.

JAPAN IS NOT A MENACE TO AN INDEPENDENT PHILIPPINES

The international situation in the Far East should not cause any worry as a danger to Philippine independence. The new principles which now govern the policy of the powerful nations are the blessings received by humanity from the bloody experiences of the World War. And for those blessings the United States is most responsible.

Viscount Ishii of Japan, addressing the United States Senate as ambassador extraordinary at the head of the Imperial Japanese mission on August 30, 1917, said, in part:

"But I grasp this occasion to say to you that the whole people of Japan heartily welcome and profoundly appreciate the entrance of this mighty Nation of yours into the struggle against the insane despoiler of our civilization. We all know that you did not undertake this solemn task on the impulse of the moment, but that you threw your mighty weight into the struggle only after exercising a most admirable patience, with a firm determination that this world shall be made free from the threat of aggression, from the black shadow of a military despotism wielded by a nation taught with the mother's milk that human right must yield to brutal might. To us the fact that you are now on the side of the Allies in this titanic struggle constitutes already a great moral victory for our common cause, which we believe to be the cause of right and justice, for the strong as for the weak, for the great as for the small."

Continuing, he said:

"We of Japan took up arms against Germany because a solemn treaty was not to us 'a scrap of paper.' We did not enter into this war because we had any selfish interest to promote or any ill-conceived ambition to gratify. We are in the war, we insist on being in it, and we shall stay in it because, earnestly, as a nation and as individuals, we believe in the righteousness of the cause for which we stand; because we believe that only by a complete victory for that cause can there be made a righteous, honorable, and permanent peace, so that this world may be made safe for all men to live in and so that all nations may work out their destinies untrammelled by fear."

Whatever may have been the diplomacy in the past and however hypocritical and ruthless the course of great nations in the past, there is now a world conscience ready to stop a soulless plunderer.

FILIPINOS ASK TO BE FREE

The world is now living in an age in which the solution of political problems, either international or national, does not call for the heroism of the 300 Spartans who perished in the battle of Thermopylae nor the genius of intriguing statesmen. Good will and good faith are growing every day among nations in the promotion of security and the blessings of independence and peace.

Agencies designed to outlaw war are sought of to be established by the leading nations. Under one name or another such agencies will become more real and effective as the years come and go. The people of all the nations can no longer stand for a bloody settlement of international differences. A common ideal of justice is becoming the supreme need of this and future ages, and the United States is playing the most important rôle in this great task.

Resting upon this hope, and especially upon the specific pledge of the United States, the Filipino people are asking that independence be granted to them in order that they may be of more service and usefulness to this great Nation, under whose unselfish leadership the world will witness the birth of a new republic in the Far East.

REUBEN R. HUNTER

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on Senate 353, an act for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter, for printing under the rules.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 353) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1; and agree to the same.

GEORGE W. EDMONDS,
CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
JOHN C. BOX,

Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
SELDEN P. SPENCER,
THOMAS F. BAYARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

COMPLETION OF THE "LEXINGTON" AND THE "SARATOGA"

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 393, a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 393

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11282, a bill to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled between those for and those against the bill, said bill shall be read for amendments under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself needs very little explanation, because it is the usual resolution from the Rules Committee. The purpose of the bill which the resolution makes in order is to increase the cost of the aircraft carriers, the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga*, from the present authorized cost of \$23,000,000 each to \$34,000,000 each. These two ships were originally two of the six battle cruisers that were authorized by the naval building program of 1916. The contract for the construction of these two boats was entered into in the year 1917, but on account of the war no work was done on either one of them at that time, because it was necessary to give our attention to the construction of other ships for use in the war. Finally the work was begun on one of them in September, 1920, and on the other in January, 1921, but all work was suspended on February 8, 1922, following the signing of the treaty limiting naval armament. At this time these two ships were about 33 per cent completed, but by the terms of this naval treaty we were authorized to convert these two ships into naval aircraft carriers. The original authorization in 1916 provided for a limit of cost of sixteen and a half million dollars. This was increased in 1917 to \$19,000,000 and again increased in 1919 to \$23,000,000. That was the

limit of cost at the time that we authorized on July 19, 1922, that they should be converted into aircraft carriers.

The work on these boats under the present limitation, unless some new authorization is given, will be completed during the present summer. When these two ships are completed they will have a displacement of 33,000 tons each and be the largest and best aircraft carriers afloat. That is the mechanics of the whole situation as it stands to-day. Here is the practical proposition that is before this House. It is not a proposition of whether you are a big Navy or a small Navy man. It is not a proposition of whether you want to spend this money or not. We have already put \$46,000,000 in the construction of these two aircraft carriers.

Unless we authorize more money the work will stop and the money that we have spent so far will be of absolutely no use. We are practically in the situation of a man who has built a house up to the second story, with four walls, and has not money enough to put the roof on the house. Unless he puts the roof on the house it will be of no use. These two boats can not be used for the purpose we are constructing them unless we increase the authorization necessary to complete them.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman state in this connection in explaining the situation what the position of the Executive is with respect to the matter, and whether or not it has been considered and is within his business program?

Mr. SNELL. This matter has been very carefully considered by all of the executive departments of the Government—by representatives of the administration, by the Navy Department, by the Naval Committee of the House, and by the Rules Committee—and there is no one anywhere that has any objection to the continuation of the program, because it seems to be absolutely necessary to protect the money that we already have in these boats. Furthermore, if we do not complete these ships, we would have to construct some more to take their places.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us where the work is being done now?

Mr. SNELL. One of these ships is being constructed at Quincy, Mass., and the other at Camden, N. J., by private corporations.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman feel confident that this further authorization will be sufficient to complete the work?

Mr. SNELL. That is a hard question for me to answer, because we have already increased the limit of cost three times. Our best information is that it will.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, three times I asked that question and endeavored three different times to get an exact statement. The Chief Constructor said that the best wisdom they could give us after making full and ample inquiry was that this would be sufficient to complete these two ships.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania had better answer this question than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Are these increased authorizations required by changes of plans?

Mr. BUTLER. Somewhat, and, to be accurate with the gentleman, the increases have been two in number. Those increases were largely made because of change of plans. These increases are asked for reasons set out in the report of the committee given to us by the best authority of the department, and to this end I will endeavor to explain, if necessary in connection with my colleagues if anyone desires it, why these large additional sums of money are needed in order to complete these two great ships.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman I am in favor of the proposal, but in this connection, with a special rule brought in, I thought a short statement in regard to the matter might very well appear in the Record.

Mr. SNELL. The reason it is necessary to have it done now is the work will stop on each ship the coming summer, and the authorization must be given so that the appropriation can be made in the final deficiency bill of this session to continue the work through the coming summer and not have any intermission of the work. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire some time?

Mr. POU. Five minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I yield the gentleman from North Carolina five minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, to a thoughtful man who considers the great question of world peace there are times when he hardly knows which way to turn. Surely we all devoutly desire world peace. I believe that America is the one Nation that is big enough and great enough and strong enough to say to the balance of the world, we will stop here and now this program of increase in naval and military armaments. [Applause.] But, Mr. Speaker, America has not said that. American is not going to say it. It seems to be an impractical dream, and therefore the thoughtful American is driven to some other alternative. For my part the alternative I have embraced is to appropriate enough money to make America's Navy incomparable. [Applause.] It seems to me, as devoutly as we hope for peace, that that is the best security and the safest attitude. I do not want a navy just big enough to be defeated by Great Britain. What is the sense of having any navy at all if you are going to have one just short of being able to conquer? I do not want any 5-4 proposition; I do not want any 10-9 proposition; I want a proposition that America can say to the world, "Here we are. We mean peace; we have no other purpose, but if you are going to force us to fight, then we are going to conquer with the help of God." And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall support this rule very heartily. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, does it require a motion under the rule to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union? If so, I move that we go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering this resolution made in order by the rule.

The SPEAKER. Of course it has no preference over an appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. We thought this would go through without much trouble, and we can finish up the appropriation bill later in the day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had not been consulted with reference to the program.

Mr. SNELL. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I consulted with the floor leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania if that is the program.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the arrangement is as to the business. I am hitched to the tongue, and I pull when the lash is put on me.

Mr. SHREVE. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

AUTHORIZING INCREASE IN THE LIMITS OF COST OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 11282, the bill provided for under the rule just adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11282, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11282, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11282) to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels

Be it enacted, etc., That the limits of cost for the construction of the U. S. S. *Lexington* and *Saratoga*, the conversion of which vessels into airplane carriers, in accordance with the terms of the treaty providing for the limitation of naval armament, was authorized by the act of July 1, 1922, is hereby increased to \$34,000,000 each.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule there will be one hour of debate. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania for one-half of that time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I humbly inquire who will have the other half? My colleague and myself are together.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know, but if there is any member of the committee in opposition to the legislation, of course he will be recognized.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No member of the committee on the minority side is in opposition to the rule or the bill, but I ask unanimous consent to control 30 minutes of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state under the rule it provides for one hour of general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by those for and against the bill, so that if there is any Member in the House opposed to the bill who desires recognition he will be entitled to recognition.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will yield to anyone who is opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps you had better hold the matter in abeyance until later developments. There may be somebody against it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, why not settle that question now?

Mr. SNELL. It is understood that the ranking minority member shall be given control of half the time.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has promised to give me some time from his allotment. I am opposed to the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia in allotting time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem worth while to go over the same track that the chairman of the Committee on Rules went over in explaining the purpose of the resolution. No one more than I do deplores the necessity which requires us to perform our duty here to-day. The Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously, after hearings conducted for some time by it for the purpose of obtaining the facts, to see whether the necessities were here, reported this measure, and we will ask you to unanimously indorse the action of this committee.

These two ships, as has already been explained to you, are ships authorized to be converted into what are known as airplane carriers by the treaty of Washington, made three years ago. They were provided for in the antiwar period of 1916. They were to be six of the greatest ships that man ever designed for destructive purposes. Four of them have gone, or will go to the bottom of the ocean. Two of them will remain for this conversion.

I know that at this time it is not, perhaps, in keeping with the desires of those who wish that peace may be maintained among the nations of the world in preparing a defense, that comparisons should be made; but you overlook the attempt I will make in that direction by telling you that England has one such vessel completed and two more under construction. If Congress authorizes what we ask for and the money is appropriated, we shall have about the same tonnage. We now have one old airplane carrier, constructed out of an old boat several years ago.

These two ships are of 34,000 or 35,000 tons each. They were to have weighed 43,000 tons as fighting ships. They are not much armed. They have some small guns on them. They have some machinery to protect them from bombers.

This statement will impress you, my colleagues: Each one of these ships will carry at least 72 airplanes and will run 35 miles an hour, the same speed that we intended they would have had provided they had not been authorized to either be destroyed or converted under the terms of the arms treaty. We can not take the airplanes to sea without aid—one thing that the military men have agreed upon, one thing that this commission recently appointed by the President to determine the facts as to the availability of aircraft for war purposes has decided, is that we can not be attacked by airplanes flying across the ocean; the distance is too great. Consequently we fear that airplanes, if we ever are attacked, might be carried on airplane carriers and brought to our coast and from there used against us. It is against that, as one of the contingencies that might arise, that these great ships are to be built and converted. They are more than one-half completed. By next summer they will be two-thirds completed, and unless this authority is given at any early date, so that the appropriation can be made, all work on these ships must cease. Two of these authorities were given originally, one in 1916 and the other in 1917 or 1918, for the purpose of changing the plans and the designs of these ships.

They are not experimental but they are improved. As to ships of this kind we had but little to go by. Now, this authority here is asked because of the increased cost of material and the increase in the rate of wages. In 1919 it was anticipated by the preceding administration, which was very, very careful in its expenditure—I will say that for it—that there

would be sufficient money after the war was over to enable us to finish the construction of these ships. But it did not turn out so. Wages and the cost of materials have materially increased. Changes have been made. There were airplane carriers to be constructed; decks and all kinds of machinery had to be provided. The plans were approved and indorsed by all the military men as the very latest models of this sort of craft.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I understand that there has been another resolution placed on an appropriation bill in the Senate providing for another disarmament conference.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This work will be about half through by next July. Suppose the conference is called next fall and the conference decides that it will do away with these airplane carriers to prevent one nation from attacking another. Are you going to sink these?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, the gentleman asks me a question that is very hard to answer. I am going to answer by saying to my friend, "Guess yourself." [Laughter.] If I thought that that resolution would result in another conference, and that the result of that conference would be a further limitation, if necessary to secure the agreement, I would say, "Yes; sink them." [Applause.]

I happen to know some of the reasons that led to the last disarmament conference. I am one of two or three living witnesses with whom President Harding spoke after the election at Marion. He knew as well as his advisers what was necessary to be done to secure an agreement, and that was to keep that great program of 1916 on the move.

These are two ships which, in my judgment, brought about the happy conclusion which was found in the Washington disarmament conference. Now, let us move on, not for the purpose of threatening any nation—no; not for that purpose—but for the purpose of equipping ourselves for a national defense. [Applause.]

I can not escape the old method of preparing a defense, that of comparison, which leads to competition.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman, of course, knows, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] also knows, that the new proposed conference will have nothing whatever to do with airplane carriers.

Mr. BUTLER. It might have.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Who is going to exclude the consideration of airplane carriers?

Mr. BRITTEN. They are already in the conference and that was arranged a couple of years ago.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But the new conference might consider airplane carriers.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; the new conference is to apply only to small craft, and it will have nothing whatever to do with capital ships.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman from Illinois may know that, but he is the only one in the country who does know it.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; the gentleman knows it, too.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, I am not close enough to the throne to hear even the whisperings of those who sit upon it, but I assume they are going to be smart enough and intelligent enough to throw open the doors to any kind of sensible agreement in the proposed conference for the further limitation of armament. [Applause.] You can not charge me with being a pacifist, because I claim to have been the originator of the largest program ever put before human beings. [Laughter.] But if we can avoid the destruction of human lives, I say in the name of God let us reach for the method. However, I am not in favor of pulling the fuse out of my gun while the other fellow has a fuse in his. [Laughter.] I want to say to my inquiring friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that I do not know what this will lead to, but I do know this: That this Congress authorized these two ships, not only to be converted according to the terms of the treaty, but they have increased the cost twice. Now, what are you going to do with them?

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. I want to inquire whether these vessels are being constructed under the cost-plus system?

Mr. BUTLER. They are not. The House will understand that these great ships of 180,000 horsepower have never before been constructed. No responsible person could be found to

undertake them and no sort of mechanic had been brought into existence that would undertake to build these ships and guarantee that they would have 45,000 horsepower on each shaft. Consequently it became necessary, when the ships were authorized by Congress, to put them out under a cost-plus 10 per cent contract. In 1921, when we began to construct them, the present administration succeeded in having supplemental contracts made with the contractors so that instead of these ships costing \$3,400,000—contractors' profits—under the 10 per cent cost-plus system they will cost but \$2,000,000. By agreeing on a fixed sum the cost of each ship has been reduced by \$1,400,000.

Mr. SPEAKS. Are we to understand that the bill proposes an increase which will mean double the cost of the original contracts?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. And I want to say in my answer to the gentleman that there has never been a ship authorized for the last eight years which has not cost double and sometimes upwards of 75 per cent more than was estimated. It is disappointing to the gentleman and it is disappointing to me. But what would the gentleman do? I can do no better than take the advice of these learned men, in whom we have very great confidence, and the committee over which I preside has the same confidence in them that I have. We are doing the best we can, as economically as we know how, and the very best for our national defense.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I understand that these vessels are being constructed on the cost-plus plan for a fixed fee. Does the gentleman know what system the Navy has in force to check up on that cost and to verify it? Do they have any system of that kind?

Mr. BUTLER. Will not the gentleman permit me to refer that question to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will say now it is a fixed fee of \$2,000,000 for each contractor for the construction of each one of these vessels. Under the original plan which Secretary Daniels put through during the war and prior to the war, if this bill had passed, the contractor would have received \$3,400,000.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. But that does not answer the question I have propounded. I want to know what system the Navy has for checking up on the cost of these ships and seeing that the cost is not inflated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Navy has in every navy yard experts who check up every bit of the work done. That system is being followed in this instance, and even if a vessel had cost \$60,000,000 the contractor could get no more than \$2,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. And if it should cost \$25,000,000, he would get \$2,000,000. He furnishes everything except the labor and material that goes into the ship, furnishing the yards and docks. I think the gentleman will find all of those things particularly set out in the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia in opposition. The gentleman from Georgia yields the gentleman from Texas 10 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields him 5 minutes, making 15 minutes in all.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I imagine that the same patriotic expression we heard from our friend from North Carolina [Mr. POU] likewise beats in the breast of every statesman in Japan, and likewise pulsates in the heart of every statesman in Great Britain.

If the matter of spending \$68,000,000 for two new airplane carriers were before the British Parliament to-day, as an argument for the passage of such legislation, they would proclaim that the United States is proposing to expend \$68,000,000 for just such purposes, and likewise the same argument would be presented to the legislative body in Japan, that the United States is proposing to expend \$68,000,000, and therefore Japan should expend at least \$68,000,000 or more for airplane carriers.

I am willing to assume for the sake of the argument that statesmen in Great Britain and in Japan are just as patriotic as patriot statesmen in the United States. I am willing to assume that statesmen neither in Great Britain nor Japan want their country to be outdone by any other country, and that they are watching us to set the example, and that what we do they will do likewise. They do not want a navy second to ours. They want an unconquerable navy, as Mr. POU expressed it, and that is the trouble with the civilized nations

of the world. They each want an army and a navy that are unconquerable, and every time we build two \$34,000,000 airplane carriers, we are going to find Japan doing likewise and Great Britain doing likewise, and then some. We have got to meet the competition and they must meet all competition.

The gentleman from Illinois, your great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN], yesterday said that we hear on the tongue of everybody "economy," "economy," and yet when it is going to be put in practice, when a move comes to take millions out of the Treasury, the ones who are behind that particular project say, "Oh, let us apply the economy somewhere else," and that is the way it goes.

When we first proposed to build these two ships they were to cost \$16,500,000 each, and then we increased the limit of cost to \$19,000,000 each, and then we increased it to \$23,000,000 each, and now this bill attempts to increase the limit of cost to \$34,000,000, or another \$11,000,000 additional increase on each ship. And then remember, too, that we are allowing them an additional margin of 20 per cent, which was provided in the original law, and has never been repealed.

This is the situation. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS] asked a very pertinent question when he asked the chairman of this great committee whether or not these ships were to be built upon a cost-plus basis. They are built on that same vicious principle, and I will never vote for it again. We are to put up all the expense, no matter how much they cost, and the contractors are to bear no loss and take no chances. They have no chance to lose. They are to get a stated fee of \$2,000,000 for each ship, and whatever they finally cost the Government has to pay it. That is the situation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Mr. SNELL. Right on that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I have only 15 minutes, and I want to use all of it, please.

Mr. SNELL. Will not the gentleman yield on that point about the \$2,000,000 fee?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know more about it than our friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]? He just stated that they were to get \$2,000,000 fee on each ship. Does the gentleman know more about it than the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]? He knows that is the fact. They would have gotten a fee of \$3,500,000 under the old program, but now they will get \$2,000,000 each; is not that so?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. They are not concerned about what these ships cost. They are not especially concerned about keeping down the cost to the Government. After we pay them their \$2,000,000 fee for building each ship, and after they spend all this \$68,000,000 we are giving them for labor and material, if these two carriers should not be completed we will have to give them enough millions more to complete them.

Go up to the Camden shipyards and see how the New York Shipbuilding Corporation conducts its affairs. It is on a big, expensive scale. They want to get and use the very best and easiest facilities and means possible for building these ships. What do they care about expense when the Government is paying the cost? I can not forget all of the waste, extravagance, and loss that the American taxpayers suffered during the war on cost-plus contracts.

I well remember the special train of palace cars down here at the station that the New York Shipbuilding Corporation provided, when upon their invitation they took us up to Camden and showed us through their yards and gave us a magnificent spread up there and then carried us around Philadelphia.

They know how to make friends of us and of course I like them personally, for they are bully good fellows, but I do not like them well enough to continue to give them \$34,000,000 to spend on a ship, and a \$2,000,000-guaranteed profit on a ship. I found out something about how they conduct their business when I went on that trip. I looked over their shipyards and looked into the method of their shipbuilding business. While some of you men were at that splendid spread, I was looking around.

Mr. BUTLER. When did the gentleman get his invitation? I did not have any.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes. This was several years ago.

Mr. BUTLER. I was living then. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. When did this junket occur? I was not there, and I would like to know something about that.

Mr. BLANTON. I see a number of colleagues here who do know all about it for they were along. It was not a Government junket. But it was a junket just the same paid for by the New York Shipbuilding Corporation.

I remember when this same committee came in here two years ago with that plan to take \$6,500,000 out of the Treasury and increase the elevation of our guns. That bill was going to pass just like this bill is passing, without any opposition. I first made a point of order against it, that we did not have any right to elevate our guns under the terms of our 5-5-3 treaty. The chairman overruled my point of order. I then took the floor in debate and fought that proposition, claiming we did not have the right to elevate our guns under the treaty, as it specifically prohibited it, but the House mowed down my opposition and finally passed the bill and the money was provided. Then the Secretary of State held it up and said, "Our naval officers have deceived us. They have misrepresented what Great Britain is doing," and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] had the manhood to stand there and tell those naval officers, "You shall not spend one dollar of that money in elevating those guns, for by misrepresentation you deceived Congress. You let that money alone. I am going to put it back into the Treasury of the United States"; and as soon as Congress met, the gentleman introduced and passed a bill here that turned back into the Treasury that \$6,500,000.

Oh, I know that this has been a pet measure of our friend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]—and he is our friend, and all of us like him, even though we can not agree with him. His committee has tried time and again to spend that \$6,500,000. They have tried time and again to elevate those guns; and yet Mr. Coolidge, the President of the United States, has within the last month put his stamp of everlasting disapproval upon that project, and he says to let it alone; he is not going to permit it; it is a violation of the treaty we have signed with other governments of the world.

So you see it does help for an humble Member of Congress to get up here sometimes and oppose these propositions, even though almost unanimously sponsored by a powerful committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. Just at that point, will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. I know the gentleman wants to be correct. Mr. Coolidge, the President, did not object on the lines suggested by the gentleman from Texas. He objected from the standpoint of economy solely, and the Secretary of State backed him up in the statement that the elevation of the guns would not be a violation of the treaty.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman ever darkened a glass and tried to look into the heart of Cal Coolidge?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not yet.

Mr. BLANTON. Because he would have to have a dark glass to keep from hurting his eyes. His heart shines with brightness, and he stands for the people on that question, and he is not going to let that money be spent; he is not going to let a treaty of the United States be used as a scrap of paper. I can not agree with the gentleman. It was stopped because of the treaty. The gentleman does not any more know the reason why Cal Coolidge prevented that money from being spent than I do.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; we do. We have his statement to the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have not been to those White House breakfasts like the gentleman, but I know something about the workings of his heart. I know why he would not let that money be spent. I heard what MARTIN MADDEN said on this floor; and the distinguished colleague of the gentleman from Illinois, who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, goes to those breakfasts and midnight receptions the same as the gentleman does, and his advice and judgment does influence the President; for besides being the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, MARTIN MADDEN is an able statesman.

What are we going to do about this big building program? Are we going to be like our friend from North Carolina [Mr. POU] and build a Navy that is unconquerable? Is that our idea as a "peaceful Nation"? That would be the idea of a militaristic kaiser, but we are a peaceful Nation. We ought to set our peaceful example to the nations of the world. We ought to say to Great Britain, we ought to say to Japan, that we, the peaceful American people, are not going to build any of these \$34,000,000 airplane carriers, that we are a peaceful Nation, that we are not embarking upon militarism, that we can protect ourselves if danger comes to us, if attacks come from abroad, that we can amply protect ourselves. We demonstrated our fitness to do that in the last war. Within the passing almost of a night we mobilized a trained Army of 4,000,000 men. We secured ships and sent our Armies across the water. We did in a short time everything that a militaristic

nation had been doing for years, and we demonstrated our unconquerable determination to see that our land and our rights should be defended. If we would set that example of peace to Great Britain and to Japan, you would find their statesmen unable to make an argument strong enough to get the taxpayers of those countries to build ships such as they and we are building now. They would follow our example. Those taxpayers are tax burdened to death over there. They do not want to spend this money. They are spending it only with the idea of defending their own interests, and if they knew that their own interests were not menaced, they would not spend it. They would like to save it; they would like to relieve themselves of these burdens.

I am going to stand here and have the courage to fight against these bills every time they come in here. I am going not only to vote against these bills every time they come in here, but I am going to speak against them in my humble way, if I am outvoted a hundred to one.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman oppose the act of Congress which authorized the conversion of these ships?

Mr. BLANTON. I voted against every bill that this Naval Affairs Committee has brought in here for these increases for the last five years, and the gentleman will find my action consistent upon them.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman speak against it?

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman will find that I have taken up the time of the House against a big Navy and building plan every time the gentleman has presented a bill.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. I have knocked out many of them on unanimous-consent days. The gentleman will remember that.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When I hated to do it, because I love the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Our affection for each other, however, must not control us here. As a business man, what are we to do with these boats? This House has unanimously, or practically so, authorized these expenditures. What are we to do? Shall we finish them or turn them into old garrets for swallows to build their nests in?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not in favor of doing with them what the gentleman did with some brand-new battleships that had never been used.

Mr. BUTLER. Taking them and sinking them?

Mr. BLANTON. Sinking them. That was a crime.

Mr. BRITTEN. Would the gentleman have voted to complete them?

Mr. BLANTON. I know that the Steel Trust wanted those boats sunk. It was to the interest of the Steel Trust to sink those boats, and get all that steel out of the competitive market. I would not have sunk one of them. I would have dismantled all of them and converted that steel into useful plowshares. I would have converted that steel into something useful. I would have converted that steel into something that would have been in competition with the high-priced steel that is on the markets to-day, which concerns the pocketbook of every farmer and stockman in the Nation. That is how I feel about it. When are we going to start the economy that we preach about so generally? Mr. MADDEN said yesterday that economy is not a specific proposition, he regrets to say, but is a general proposition. When you preach economy everybody is for it, but when you come to apply it specifically, then everybody is against it. Each wants to apply it to every project except his own. The Naval Affairs Committee wants to apply it to the Army but not to itself, and vice versa. We do not apply it; we preach it. I am going to apply it, and vote against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I voice my protest against the proposed action in this case. If we were trying to get some legislation for the farmers of the West, you could not get a rule out of the Committee on Rules with a crowbar and sledge hammer, but when it comes to fixing a war machine and implement to carry on war, to help some contractors in the East, why, you can get a special rule that carries an authorization for an appropriation of \$22,000,000 of the people's money. Now, let me say this to you: This arms conference, the way they are carrying it out, is going to cost the United States more money than if we had kept on with our competitive armament program. It is costing

more money of the people to comply with the treaty than it would if we had gone ahead with the program of competitive armament. Oh, they say we want to fix these airplane carriers involving \$22,000,000, more of the people's money. Why do you not wait until the new Congress comes in here? Are you Republicans afraid to risk that new Congress? You have got enough sins of omission to answer for, and here is one of commission that you will have to answer to the people of this country. Why, it is an attempt to take \$22,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the American taxpayers and put it upon a program of increasing the armament of the Navy. They are going to have aircraft ships. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] said, would we let them go along and become bat holes and places for birds to roost in? No; but I would junk them and sell the junk, if I could junk them. I do not want to spend another dollar of the people's money on these old boats that we talk so much about. This is a small matter, only \$11,000,000 apiece; it is a small matter for these taxpayers in the United States, the taxpayers from New York, from Pennsylvania, those States that pay such large amounts into the Treasury of the United States; oh, it is a small sum and they do not care.

But, gentlemen, you listen. Why do not you wait until the next Congress comes in? Why do not you give the newly elected Congress a chance to express itself? I said in the outset that when you talk about a peace program, when you talk about the arms conference, it does not mean, according to the construction of men of this House—it does not mean an attempt to reduce armament. If it were not for the President of the United States I do not know where this thing would go. He stopped the elevation of guns. He is the only hope for the taxpayers of this country, because there is no minority report here from any Member on the Democratic side, and what I have got to say about this extravagance is just as applicable to the minority Members who favor the report on file. I take it for granted that a large number of the Members of the House are in favor of spending \$22,000,000 on these ships, and you are now trying to put a tax on the magazines and newspapers of this country to pay a deficit, to pay the post-office employees reasonable wages, and yet here at one fell stroke you propose to take \$22,000,000 of the money, or nearly enough to pay the post-office employees; you are willing to take it out of the United States Treasury and put a tax on the magazines and newspapers of this country that carry the intelligence and information to the people of this country. If that is your program, make the most of it and see whether or not the American people at the next election will indorse such a program. Why, it is outrageous to come in here and take \$22,000,000 of the people's money in one stroke and put it on naval vessels that are outlawed under the treaty and then come in here and ask to put a tax on the newspapers and magazines of this country to make up a deficiency occasioned by an increase in the pay of postal employees. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, as a rule, I am in accord with my colleague from Oklahoma on matters relating to armor and the protection of our Navy. But in this particular instance I am of the opinion that if we are to have a Navy and are going to maintain a Navy, it is necessary to provide a method so that airplanes can be carried on ships. I have not been in accord with the majority of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs on a great many programs. When the war with Germany and her allies was completed, it left the world in a deplorable condition; England and France were bled white because of the loss of man power; Russia was in the hands of the Bolsheviks; Austria, Germany, Turkey, and the other nations were in bad financial straits. Therefore, when the question of completing the 1916 shipbuilding program, which would have cost approximately \$1,000,000,000, came up for consideration before the Naval Affairs Committee, I opposed the same on the grounds that there was not a nation on earth financially able to start another war, and I was of the opinion that the lesson taught during the recent struggle would be sufficient to cause all nations to refrain from engaging in hostilities for a number of years.

I believe I was the only Member of the Naval Affairs Committee who took this stand.

A little later a disarmament conference was called, and Secretary Denby and Admiral Coontz to a large extent, represented our Navy. I believed that they would use good judgment in protecting the interests of the country, and, of course, we were all amazed when it was found out that a policy was

adopted which caused our new ships to be scrapped and the old ones retained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that far more efficiency can be secured for the Navy if we will appropriate sufficient money to construct airplane carriers to navigate the air, for it has already been demonstrated that planes can be launched and reattach themselves to ships of this type. Therefore, I believe it will be only a few years until we shall construct great dirigibles sufficiently large to carry just as many planes as these airplane carriers will take care of when completed. Of course, there are those who will object to this appropriation. However, we are in a position similar to the person who had hold of the tail of a bear and could not turn loose. A contract was let for the construction of these airplane carriers on a 10 per cent plus cost plan; later on, it was agreed that they should be completed on a fixed-fee basis, which would give the contractors an additional sum of \$2,000,000 for each ship, and no one can say what they will cost before they are finally completed, because we do not have any way to know what will be charged up against the two ships. Therefore, to protect our investment, it is necessary to pass this bill.

The two types of airplane carriers which have been authorized to be constructed will be termed by some as monstrosities for the reason they contain engineering features which are excessive when compared to the modern types of battleships, in that the horsepower is extraordinarily excessive.

When it is taken into consideration that the weight of 72 planes is not very heavy when making a comparison with the usual tonnage of a battleship, and that the horsepower of average battleships is less than 100,000, I can not understand why it was necessary to provide these two carriers with boilers which will produce 180,000 horsepower each, and this is probably one reason why it is going to cost so much to complete the same.

Notwithstanding the fact that I have opposed the construction of what I term useless battleships in the past, I am convinced that in order to maintain an efficient Navy, it is necessary that carriers be provided, and I feel it is my duty to support this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please advise me when I have used five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the last statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] as to why the horsepower of these ships is so much greater than that of the average battleship, I will say it is because the purpose of an airplane carrier is to go in front of the line, far in advance of the battle fleet. Therefore they must have more horsepower and more speed.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to give a little information as to the reason why we are again asking for an additional appropriation.

The *Lexington* and *Saratoga* were originally two of the six battle cruisers included in the building program of 1916. The contract for the building of the *Lexington* as a battle cruiser was entered into with the Fore River Shipping Corporation, Quincy, Mass., April, 1917. The contract for the *Saratoga* was entered into with the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, of Camden, N. J., in May, 1917.

From the date of the contract down to the time that we entered the war on April 6, 1917, practically no work was undertaken on these vessels, and as a result of the war the keel of the *Lexington* was not laid down until January, 1921, and September 25, 1920, for the *Saratoga*.

The work on these vessels was stopped on February 8, 1922, following the signing of the treaty limiting naval armaments. At that time the *Lexington* was 33 per cent complete and the *Saratoga* 34 per cent. Under the terms of the treaty it was agreed that these two battle cruisers should be converted into airplane carriers. The original contracts for the construction of the two battle cruisers was based on the cost plus 10 per cent plan. Before the keel of either one of these vessels had been laid down, as a matter of fact, on December 7, 1920, and October 11, 1920, the contracts were changed to a cost plus a fixed fee, which was \$2,000,000.

Under the cost plus 10 per cent plan the contractor for the construction of these ships, with the passage of this bill, would receive \$3,400,000, but by the new contract, the same being cost plus a fixed fee, the contractors receive but \$2,000,000 each. The original cost of the *Lexington* and *Saratoga* was provided for in the 1916 building program bill at \$16,500,000 each. By the act of March 4, 1917, the cost was increased to \$19,000,000. By the act of July 11, 1919, the limit of cost was fixed at \$23,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the gentleman falls into an error there in that statement, for this reason: That the act authorizing these ships to be built placed a limitation on the cost.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And the first contract, which gave 10 per cent, was limited by what Congress had done in fixing the original price, so that it could not have been 10 per cent of \$34,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; but Congress fixed the price at \$23,000,000 in the act of July 11, 1919, and under that authorization, unless the contract was changed, the contractor would receive \$2,300,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. These two ships, as I understand, were to be built on plans prepared by the department?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What does the contractor do, or what does he give besides his work?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He constructs the ship according to naval plans and specifications.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What does he do for his fee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He builds the ship according to contract and specifications.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Would it not be wise to defer this?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. And the reason is that the appropriation of \$23,000,000 will be expended this summer, and it would be folly to let these ships stand until Congress meets in December. If the gentleman were building a house and had it all finished but the roof, would he wait one year before putting on the roof? A wise man would finish the construction as early as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed five minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will take two minutes more.

The speed of these airplane carriers will be between 33 and 34 knots an hour; they have a horsepower of 180,000. They can carry 72 planes, or four groups of 18 planes each. Under the treaty they are permitted to carry only 8-inch guns. The cost plus fee is a little less than 6 per cent on the \$34,000,000. These vessels have a draft of 31 feet and are 874 feet long and have a tonnage of 43,500 tons.

Now, it is pertinent to state here that under the treaty we are not up to the ratio allowed us in airplane carriers. As a matter of fact, we could construct another airplane carrier.

Now, let me say that the main part of the increase in the cost of construction is due to the same causes that have resulted in an increase in the cost of construction of other vessels building at private shipyards on cost-plus contracts and of vessels building at navy yards during the period since the war. These are, first, the increases in wages and prices of material, which now stand at about 1.8 as compared with the 1916 level; and, second, the increase in the overhead expenses due to the small amount of shipbuilding work, which has caused shipbuilding plants to operate at much below their normal output. In addition to the above causes, which affected the cost of all vessels under construction during this period, the cost of these two vessels has been further increased, though to a lesser extent, by the cost of certain work undertaken for the vessels as battle cruisers and which could not be utilized in their construction as airplane carriers, and by the additional delay necessitated by the preparation of a new set of plans in connection with the conversion.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as required by Circular No. 49, issued by that bureau, for information as to whether or not it came within the financial program of the President, and under date of January 2, 1925, the director advised the department "that this proposed legislation is not in conflict with his (the President's) financial program."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague Mr. BRITTEN. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I realize, as some of my friends do who are calling for a vote, that this bill should receive no opposition whatever. It is merely continuing a con-

tract for the construction of a couple of ships, and we have either got to continue the contracts or abandon the shipbuilding. So there should be no objection to this bill.

I want to call the attention of the House to one or two points in order to make clear just what our status is on airplane carriers. When these two ships have been completed we will have only three airplane carriers. Japan will have three, and England will have six, so that we are away behind England and practically on a parity with Japan in airplane carriers. I think, gentlemen, that the airplane carrier is more important in the defense of the Nation than even a battleship itself.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Does the *Langley* carry as many planes?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; the *Langley* is a very small, experimental craft.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. But that is the third one the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. And it does not carry as many planes as the English or Japanese airplane carriers?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. In the matter of airplane tonnage, when these two wonderful ships have been completed, we and Japan will have practically the same tonnage in airplane carriers, although from a ratio standpoint we should have five to her three. That puts us at a disadvantage on airplane carriers.

I want to call attention to the building program of Great Britain. She is building two capital ships. I do not know whether the Navy Department itself knows just what those capital ships constitute, whether they are battleships or airplane carriers. They are ships without funnels on main decks, no guns aft; they carry 16-inch guns and have heavy armor; and yet they are plane carriers to all intents and purposes. A clear deck space gives a long, broad sweep for the launching of airplanes, thus increasing the vessel's battle radius by hundreds of miles. The absence of funnels provides unobstructed space for planes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How many planes does the gentleman understand these new British ships are to carry?

Mr. BRITTEN. Various estimates have been made all the way from 30 to 70. Now, the question is: I want to know whether Great Britain is pulling the wool over our eyes again and constructing plane carriers under the guise of capital ships? I do not know whether the Navy Department has yet ascertained just what kind of ships the British are building.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am for the gentleman's bill, but does the gentleman think that the use of that kind of language on this floor with reference to another nation is really contributing to the harmony and amity of nations?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, I hope the House will not declare war against Great Britain this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I refer to the use of such language as "pulling the wool over our eyes."

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, I will repeat: I want to know if they are pulling the wool over our eyes, as they have in the past whenever we attempt to negotiate with them diplomatically.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I am in favor of the gentleman's bill, although I am not one of the extreme Navy men. But Great Britain does not conduct these matters in secret. There has never been any trouble about finding out what Great Britain is doing, except by the misrepresentation that has come from naval officers before your committee, as I have shown here several times. [Applause.] And a year afterwards the gentleman and the members of his committee had to admit that wrong information had been given.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to my friend that these ships are being constructed in a rather secret manner. We do not know their specific characteristics. We have been told by some experts that they are plane carriers, and we have been told by other experts that they are capital ships and not plane carriers. From all I have heard they might be either or both. I am wondering whether our Navy Department knows what is going on. When we attempt to elevate our guns and make our capital ships as powerful as England she immediately objects and says that the elevation of guns is a violation of the treaty. Our Government contends to the contrary. Great Britain is constantly protecting herself by her superior

diplomacy all over the world, and I want the United States to do the same thing. The country will back any opinion made by our present Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have five minutes to yield my friend.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then yield me two minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am going to yield the gentleman all the time I can. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has five minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has three minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to yield one minute more to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present to the House a communication which I received at my Chicago address from one of the peers of the Japanese Parliament, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be read in my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BRITTEN. This is to be read in my time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on that. I understand all communications from foreign governments must come through our State Department. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; but I may not have time to answer it in the one minute I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then I will read it in my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have just had one minute yielded to me and I have not spoken. I will only require a minute to read this communication.

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. BRITTEN. From Mr. Teiichi Sugita, member of the House of Peers, Tokyo, Japan:

TOKYO, December 29, 1924.

To FRED ALBERT BRITTEN, Esq.,

327 Belden Avenue, Chicago.

SIR: In inclosing herewith a copy of the resolution passed at a meeting held on the 21st instant under the auspices of the Tai Bel Mondai Yushi Association, representing all classes of the Japanese people, I respectfully beg to request that you will exert your utmost to persuade the American Government to abandon the naval maneuvers.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am, sir,

Yours respectfully,

TEIICHI SUGITA,

Chairman of the Meeting.

Resolution

Whereas America has decided to concentrate her whole Navy in the Pacific for the purpose of holding grand naval maneuvers, with Hawaii as the central base of operations, extending over a period of nine months from January next;

Whereas America intends to invite Australia and New Zealand to participate in the said maneuvers—

Which is not correct—

Whereas the above action of America tends to disregard completely the spirit of the Washington conference and to menace the peace of the Far East—

Which is also incorrect—

We, Mitsuru Toyama and the members of the Tai Bel Mondai Yushi Taikai, representing all classes of the Japanese people and all political parties, publicly assembled to-day, December 21, 1924, do hereby earnestly hope that the American Government, out of due regard to international morality and the cause of world peace, will immediately abandon the disquieting plan.

TEIICHI SUGITA,

Member of the House of Peers and

Chairman of the Meeting.

TOKYO, JAPAN, December 21, 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the House ought to know this, and that is the reason I wanted it read into the Record.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not authentic as coming from that Government?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; not from the Government. Here is the envelope it came in—from Mr. Sugita, chairman of the meeting.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean that is not from the Government, but just from an individual.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I do not believe in war if there is any honorable method of avoiding it. I believe in international cooperation, arbitration, and the settlement of disputes between nations according to law and justice, but the trouble about the proposition is that the world has not seemingly come to that conclusion, and it seems that the people of the United States are not yet ready to crystallize that feeling into any concrete action.

In this sort of situation there is nothing else for the United States to do, as I view it, but to maintain an adequate Navy to protect our interests on the high seas. For this reason I am going to vote for this bill, not because I fear any war with Japan, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] seems to fear, and not because I fear any war with Great Britain, because I do not believe we are going to have any war with either one of them; but it is simply a question of whether or not our national interests require that, to protect ourselves against the future and its uncertainties, we should maintain a Navy adequate to our defense.

I deprecate very much the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. We all recognize that he is technically well posted on the Navy, but when it comes to the passage of a naval bill, is it necessary that we try to make the world believe that in doing so we are entertaining some particular animus or some particular objective toward Japan or toward Great Britain.

I am not voting for this bill as a threat against Japan or against Great Britain, or against any other power, but I am voting for it because I believe it is my duty as a Member of this Congress, a duty to the taxpayers, and I have as high regard for the taxpayers as any Member. I would be delighted if we could have a Navy without levying taxes, but I believe it is a duty we owe our country and the future generations of our country to provide an adequate Navy.

I merely suggested the impropriety of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] dragging into the debate this Japanese bugaboo that he sees behind every bush. And it is a rather remarkable circumstance that the gentleman from Illinois, contrary to all custom and usage as between foreign nations, should have contact, direct contact, with a member of the national congress of Japan. Usually such communications are transmitted through the State Department or through the embassy or through the foreign representative of that government, and I am rather surprised that the gentleman from Illinois should seek to put that kind of a face upon this situation.

Then the gentleman stood on the floor here and stated that he wondered if Great Britain was trying to pull the wool over our eyes again, and when I questioned him as to the propriety of it, he repeated it and said she had pulled the wool over our eyes. No; she did not. We had gentleman in the disarmament conference.

The Secretary of State, I am sure, is equally as shrewd as the average Member of the House. [Laughter.] We had there the experts of the Navy Department, whom I have heard the gentleman from Illinois stand on this floor and compliment and praise to the skies. They knew what they were doing. These representatives of America, I am sure, realized it was getting the small end of the disarmament conference. We all realize it now, and those who were in the conference realized, perhaps, that we were sacrificing more in that conference than any other nation in the world, and realizing that they hoped, perhaps, that because of that sacrifice and because of the fact that the world would see that sacrifice the nations might be impressed with the fact that in the interest of humanity all over the world it was best that all nations agree to disarm as far as practicable.

But the result of that maneuver is that the other nations have gone on arming in those respects in which they were not limited by the treaty, and as long as they do there is no other course that is dictated by safety, that is dictated by our national duty, that is dictated by the most solemn considerations of common sense and patriotism, except for the United States in our own interests to maintain a Navy, efficient and of fight-

ing strength, up to the standard provided by the disarmament conference. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limits of cost for the construction of the U. S. S. *Lexington* and *Saratoga*, the conversion of which vessels into airplane carriers, in accordance with the terms of the treaty providing for the limitation of naval armament, was authorized by the act of July 1, 1922, is hereby increased to \$34,000,000 each.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want the attention of the committee for only a moment. It has been decided by the highest authorities who are entitled to speak and it is the belief of this administration, as has been revealed to us sitting as a committee, that every nation which signed the disarmament treaty is living honestly up to it. [Applause.] There is no variation from its terms by either England or Japan, but all of these nations are scrupulously—and that is the language of the Secretary of the Navy—keeping the letter and the spirit of the agreement made in Washington. I agree with my friend from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that there is but one of two things left for us to do. Either we must make the preparation which in our honest, sober judgment is necessary for a national defense or there must be another agreement by which our armaments are further limited.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], after he had read the letter addressed to his particular street number in his home city by a Japanese politician, said he thought the House and the country ought to know it. He did not disclose anything new in that letter. That letter simply reports what any sane, sensible man would expect, and fear, that the people of Japan are being inflamed and misled by demagogues in Japan, just as demagogues and publicity seekers in this country are trying to inflame the American people. [Applause.] I have said before on this floor, and I repeat it, that there is room on the earth for the development of the peoples of both America and Japan, working in competition, it may be true, but a friendly rivalry in competition, which will not conflict with either the dignity or the material welfare of either nation. It would be a tragedy for Japan, as much as it would be a tragedy for the United States, if thoughtless demagogues inflamed the passions of a patriotic people and led these two great nations into conflict, the result of which would be the sacrifice of treasure and of the youth of both lands. [Applause.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] of course can pursue his own course, but as for me, thinking of my own lad and of the boys of other men and women of this Nation, I shall insist that men in responsible place at least measure their words when they play with those elemental passions which from time immemorial have needlessly brought nations into conflict. The statesmen of both Japan and the United States are working together in perfect harmony, each maintaining rigidly the rights of each, and there is no danger of war with Japan unless the demagogues of Japan inflame the mad passions of the people of Japan, and the demagogues of America inflame the mad passions of America, so that the thoughtful judgment of statesmen directing the destinies of these two nations are overwhelmed. If such a thing should eventuate, it would be a tragedy, and I would hate to have the responsibility on my soul of shedding the blood that these irresponsible demagogues in the two countries will have if such a thing should happen.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret more than I can express that any intimation should have been given in the course of this debate that other nations connected with the disarmament treaty did not act with perfect fairness. At the time it was framed there was no concealment, no effort to mislead this country as to the resources of armament and the power of the navies of those other countries engaged, when the treaty was entered into. That such is the fact is evident because no one has made any such claim since that time. Anyone who will take the trouble to go to the library and ascertain the construction of the navies of these different powers which entered into the treaty at the time can get the full information on the subject.

The "wool was not pulled over the eyes" of this country. As one gentleman has already said, the experts of our Navy sat with the representatives of the State Department of this Government in framing that great measure. We knew perfectly well what we were doing at that time and we under-

stood perfectly that only the construction of vessels of a certain kind were limited by the treaty. Great Britain is now constructing two battleships, or is about to construct them. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can say whether the keels have yet been laid.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, they are more than laid; they are completing them quite fast, but they are strictly named in the conference treaty.

Mr. GREEN. Great Britain is in no respect violating the treaty, but on the contrary is doing what the treaty expressly permitted. It is probable that in constructing these vessels an effort is made to have them on the most approved lines within the limits of the treaty, which is being observed as to size, as to armament, and as to all other particulars which were specified in the treaty. It is possible that they are to be constructed without funnels. There are certain reasons for that. On the last two vessels that we have constructed the funnels are so made that at certain angles of vision they are not seen, although the funnels are there. However that may be, there was no provision in the treaty against building battleships without funnels, and as to the plan to construct them with the main battery forward, instead of aft, there is nothing in the treaty providing against that. There may be much argument as to whether or not that is an advantage. In conflict battleships do not as a rule fight bow on, because it gives a better chance for the enemy to hit a ship that is so placed.

The whole matter may be summed up by saying that it was agreed that Great Britain might build these ships in order to make her fleet equal to our own, and we have reason neither for complaint nor alarm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate is exhausted on this amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been only one speech on the last pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think he gives way to me.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order debate is exhausted, and there is nothing before the House unless it be a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a pro forma amendment, upon which there has been one speech.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am waiting a favorable opportunity to move that the committee rise.

Mr. DOWELL. Why does not the gentleman do it?

Mr. BUTLER. Because there is an amendment before the House to which the gentleman from New York rises in opposition and also the gentleman from Illinois, and as early as possible I shall move that the committee rise.

Mr. DOWELL. A member of the Committee on Naval Affairs is now claiming the floor. If the gentleman desires to make a motion, it is in order; but I insist that further debate on a pro forma motion means it is unlimited and a waste of time, and we ought to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the first motion was to strike out the last word, upon which there was one speech for and one against. The Chair, without objection, withdrew that pro forma amendment. Then there was a pro forma amendment made to strike out the last two words, upon which there has been one speech, and the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee, now demands recognition against that amendment; and in the opinion of the Chair he ought to be recognized.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, under a strict interpretation of the rule if the gentleman from Iowa would press his point he would be compelled to discuss actually the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman begins his speech it would under those circumstances be necessary for him to address himself to the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is there not some rule somewhere which provides that if a Member speaks once he shall not speak until everybody else has a chance to speak on the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois spoke in general debate.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not objecting to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will require not to exceed three minutes and perhaps only two minutes. I want to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] that the same kind of speech he made here to-day could reasonably have been made by himself, and probably was made by himself, against Captain Hobson, a very distinguished Member from the gentleman's side of the House some 10 years ago, when Hobson was advocating a big Navy. Talk of a big Navy always brings forth the cry of "jingo" by the little Navy men and pacifists. I feel like the gentleman from Arkansas does, that there is not the slightest prospect of war between this country and Japan, not the slightest, and I will go further than that and say there never will be a war between this country and Japan so long as we absolutely control the Pacific, and that is what we have got to do. As long as I am in this House I shall raise my voice for the purpose of keeping our Navy at top speed and in the highest efficiency for the protection of this country and the control of the Pacific Ocean, and when we fail to control the Pacific, gentlemen, you may make up your minds there will be war pending immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted upon the pending amendment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I can not move that this committee rise when a gentleman is on his feet to make a further amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the paragraph. The other amendment, without objection, will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I admit that this bill could pass, that the committee could rise without my speech, but, gentlemen, I do not believe it is fair at any time to apply the gag rule to Members of this House. In connection with this bill I simply want to say, supplemental of what the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said, that if the men of this country who do the talking would have some consideration for the men who do the fighting we would go a long way toward permanent peace. [Applause.] I voted against the appropriation for the elevation of guns, and my vote was justified by subsequent events. In this case a different proposition presents itself. I am going to vote for this appropriation or authorization because it is experimental in every sense of the word. If we can succeed in developing aviation to that point of establishing daily contact with other countries of the world, I believe that, too, will be a great step toward permanent peace. Now, when I rose and objected to the reading of a letter which, as suggested, came from an official of another nation, I believe I was justified in doing so. You have here a living example of how easy it is for information to be distorted and misunderstandings to be pyramided. First, some gentleman from Japan misunderstands the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois and he writes a letter. Then the gentleman from Illinois misunderstands the gentleman from Japan and brings in here a letter which purports to be from a Government official, and so the misunderstanding instead of clarifying keeps growing. I do not believe that any Member of Congress should have any correspondence with any foreign government [applause], and that is the law as I understand it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield? It was not purported that the correspondence came from the Japanese Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let me make that clear. I know one thing, if I received a letter from a member of parliament of a foreign country, I would refer it to the State Department. I would not reply to it or bring it on the floor of this House.

It is the easiest thing in the world to create misunderstanding in just that way. I agree with what has been said here by the gentleman from Texas, that the least we can do is to permit the State Department to conduct the foreign affairs of our country, and we should attend to our own business here on the floor of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move—

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. We have to conform to the rule. Gentlemen speaking on the measure must confine themselves to the measure. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise and report the resolution to the House.

Mr. BEEDY. I wish to speak on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. SNELL. The chairman of the committee in charge of the bill has the right to make that motion.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to cut anybody off. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY] may speak for two minutes. Then I will make the motion to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Nobody here talks less than the gentleman from Maine. It does not cost the Government anything to keep him here. [Laughter.]

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, if this is to be the last one, I will withhold my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am very grateful to the gentlemen of the House. I take very little of the time of this House, but I rise to say a word which I hope may be of help to all of us here and to the country.

This debate has assumed in some respects perhaps an unfortunate aspect. You and I hold positions of public trust, and I rise to say that I think the gentlemen who sit in this press gallery, listen to these debates, and send out the reports addressing a much vaster audience than you and I, also hold positions of public trust. I submit to this House and the gentlemen in the press gallery that the news item growing out of this debate is not that some one has risen here to warn against the danger of war with any country. The news item for the country is that every Member of the House participating in this debate has expressed his interest in the maintenance of friendly relations with other nations, and has stressed the fact that there is no danger of war; no intimation is here made that the present situation contains any of the possibilities of war. And I rise to remind the gentlemen of the press that they, more than Members of this House, can create misunderstanding and provoke trouble by yielding to the temptation to write sensational headlines rather than accurate reports of events. One way to prevent war is to stop talking and writing about war when facts do not justify it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11282) to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels, had directed him to refer the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not recollect all the terms of the rule, but I move the previous question on the measure.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for that. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 97, noes 17.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will summon absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 34, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—255

Abernethy	Barkley	Brand, Ga.	Byrns, Tenn.
Ackerman	Beedy	Brand, Ohio	Cable
Aldrich	Beers	Britten	Campbell
Allen	Begg	Browne, N. J.	Chindblom
Andrew	Bell	Browne, Wis.	Christopherson
Arnold	Bixler	Browning	Clague
Ayres	Black, Tex.	Brumm	Clarke, N. Y.
Bacharach	Bulwinkle	Burtness	Cleary
Bacon	Bowling	Butler	Cole, Iowa
Bankhead	Box	Byrnes, S. C.	Collier
Barbour	Boyce		Colton

Connally, Tex.	Hill, Ala.	Martin	Snell
Connelly	Holaday	Merritt	Snyder
Cook	Hooker	Michener	Stalker
Cooper, Ohio	Hudson	Miller, Ill.	Stedman
Cramton	Hudspeth	Miller, Wash.	Stengle
Crisp	Hull, Iowa	Milligan	Stephens
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Minahan	Strong, Kans.
Darrow	Humphreys	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Davey	James	Mooney	Summers, Wash.
Davis, Minn.	Jeffers	Moore, Ohio	Swing
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Va.	Taber
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Tex.	Morgan	Thatcher
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Morrow	Thomas, Ky.
Drane	Jones	Murphy	Thompson
Drewry	Jost	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Driver	Kearns	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Dyer	Keller	Nolan	Treadway
Elliot	Kelly	O'Connell, R. I.	Tucker
Evans, Mont.	Kerr	Oldfield	Tydings
Fairfield	Ketcham	Oliver, Ala.	Underhill
Faust	Kincheloe	Oliver, N. Y.	Underwood
Fenn	King	Parks, Ark.	Upshaw
Fish	Knutson	Patterson	Valle
Fitzgerald	Kopp	Peery	Vare
Fleetwood	Kurtz	Perkins	Vinson, Ga.
Frear	LaGuardia	Pou	Voigt
French	Lampert	Purnell	Wainwright
Frothingham	Lanham	Quin	Wason
Gallivan	Larsen, Ga.	Ragan	Watkins
Garber	Lazaro	Raker	Watson
Gardner, Ind.	Lea, Calif.	Ramseyer	Weaver
Garrett, Tenn.	Leavitt	Rankin	Wefald
Garrett, Tex.	Lehlbach	Rathbone	Wertz
Gasque	Lilly	Rayburn	White, Kans.
Gibson	Lineberger	Reece	White, Me.
Gifford	Logan	Reid, Ill.	Williams, Ill.
Green	Longworth	Robinson, Iowa	Williams, Tex.
Greenwood	Lozier	Robison, Ky.	Williamson
Griest	Luce	Rubey	Wilson, Ind.
Guyer	McChattie	Sabath	Wilson, La.
Hadley	McDuffie	Salmon	Wingo
Hall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.	Winslow
Hammer	McReynolds	Sandlin	Winter
Hardy	McSwain	Schneider	Wood
Harrison	MacGregor	Scott	Woodruff
Hastings	MacLafferty	Sears, Fla.	Woodrum
Haugen	Magee, N. Y.	Sears, Nebr.	Wright
Hawes	Major, Ill.	Shreve	Wurzbach
Hawley	Major, Mo.	Simmons	Wyant
Hayden	Manlove	Sinclair	Yates
Hersey	Mansfield	Sinnot	Zihlman
Hickey	Mapes	Sites	

NAYS—34

Allgood	Crosser	Kvale	Sanders, Tex.
Almon	Dickinson, Iowa	Lankford	Sherwood
Beck	Dowell	Lowrey	Speaks
Bianton	Fulbright	McKeown	Steagall
Boles	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Ga.	Summers, Tex.
Busby	Howard, Nebr.	Morehead	Swank
Cannon	Howard, Okla.	Park, Ga.	Thomas, Okla.
Collins	Huddleston	Reed, Ark.	
Cooper, Wis.	Hull, Morton D.	Romjue	

NOT VOTING—142

Anderson	Favrot	McKenzie	Rosenbloom
Anthony	Fisher	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rouse
Aswell	Foster	McLeod	Sanders, N. Y.
Berger	Fredericks	McNulty	Schafer
Black, N. Y.	Free	McSweeney	Schall
Bloom	Freeman	Madden	Seger
Boylan	Fuller	Magee, Pa.	Shallenberger
Briggs	Fulmer	Mead	Smith
Buchanan	Funk	Michaelson	Smithwick
Buckley	Gambrill	Mills	Spearing
Burdick	Garner, Tex.	Moore, Ill.	Sproul, Ill.
Burton	Geran	Morin	Sproul, Kans.
Canfield	Gilbert	Morris	Stevenson
Carew	Glatfelter	Nelson, Wis.	Sullivan
Carter	Goldsborough	Newton, Minn.	Sweet
Casey	Graham	O'Brien	Tague
Celler	Griffin	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tague
Clancy	Hill, Md.	O'Connor, La.	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Fla.	Hoch	O'Connor, N. Y.	Taylor, W. Va.
Cole, Ohio	Hull, William E.	O'Sullivan	Temple
Connolly, Pa.	Jacobstein	Padge	Timberlake
Corning	Johnson, W. Va.	Parker	Tincher
Croll	Kendall	Peavey	Tinkham
Cullen	Kent	Perlman	Vestal
Cummings	Kless	Phillips	Vincent, Mich.
Curry	Kindred	Porter	Vinson, Ky.
Dallinger	Kunz	Prall	Ward, N. Y.
Deal	Langley	Quayle	Ward, N. C.
Dempsey	Larsen, Minn.	Rainey	Watres
Dickstein	Leach	Ransley	Weller
Dominick	Leatherwood	Reed, N. Y.	Welsh
Doyle	Lee, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.	Williams, Mich.
Eagan	Lindsay	Richards	Wilson, Miss.
Edmonds	Linthicum	Roach	Wolff
Evans, Iowa	Lyon	Rogers, Mass.	
Fairchild	McFadden	Rogers, N. H.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Graham with Mr. Black of New York.
Mr. Hill of Maryland with Mr. Rainey.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Briggs.
Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Aswell.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. Paige with Mr. Deal.
Mr. Smith with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Vinson of Kentucky.
Mr. Seger with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Favrot.
Mr. Swoope with Mr. Tague.
Mr. Watres with Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Funk with Mr. Garner of Texas.
Mr. Evans of Iowa with Mr. Croll.
Mr. Free with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Fulmer.
Mr. Sweet with Mr. Carter.
Mr. McLeod with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Timberlake with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Kent.
Mr. Williams of Michigan with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Kless with Mr. Geran.
Mr. Ransley with Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. William E. Hull with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Weller.
Mr. Vincent of Michigan with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Sanders of New York with Mr. Eagan.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. O'Connell of Rhode Island.
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Welsh with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Larson of Minnesota with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Roach with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Parker with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Newton of Minnesota with Mr. Smithwick.
Mr. Foster with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rouse.
Mr. Anderson with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Dallinger with Mr. Glatfelter.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Leach with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Wilson of Mississippi.
Mr. McLaughlin of Nebraska with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. McSweeney.
Mr. Tincher with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Leatherwood with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Temple with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Fairchild with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Peavey with Mr. Taylor of West Virginia.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Tinkham with Mr. McNulty.
Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
Mr. Schall with Mr. Shallenberger.
Mr. Perlman with Mr. Jacobstein.
Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Schafer with Mr. Doyle.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

On motion of Mr. WOODRUFF, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DISABLED SOLDIERS' LEAGUE

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 412, which I desire to call up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEHLBACH). The gentleman from South Dakota presents a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 412

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of the House a select committee of five Members for the Sixty-eighth Congress, which said committee is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the National Disabled Soldiers' League (Inc.), its methods of solicitation of funds, sources of revenue, character and pay of officials, distribution of funds for the benefit of the veterans of the World War, uses of the United States mails, implication of indorsement by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and all other matters pertaining to the organization and conduct of said league.

For the purpose of said inquiry, the committee, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have the power to send for persons, papers, books, and documents, administer oaths, affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess of the House.

Such committee shall have the right at any time to report to the House in one or more reports the result of its inquiry, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The Speaker is hereby empowered to issue subpoenas to witnesses upon the request of the chairman of said committee at any time, including any recess of the House, during the inquiry of the committee; and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all subpoenas and other processes transferred to him by the said committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution originally introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] providing for an investigation of the National Disabled Soldiers' League. This organization was formed in 1919 by an aggregation of men, some service men and some non-service men, who contended that they were going to collect sums of money for the benefit of disabled veterans of the World War. It was developed at that time—some three or four years ago—that this organization was collecting great sums of money, but that none of it was disbursed for the benefit of any disabled soldiers. A preliminary investigation was initiated by the Rules Committee as the result of a resolution which I introduced and had referred to that committee. We held hearings for several days and demonstrated the fact that this was a very unworthy organization, and it went out of business; but some other gentleman, finding that this is a very profitable field, particularly around Christmas time, when it is very easy to secure contributions from philanthropic citizens of the United States to help disabled men, have reorganized it, and they have invented a new system of securing donations. They purchased approximately \$45,000 worth of very cheap lead pencils in bulk, then they got so-called "sucker" mailing lists, or mailing lists of some kind, and sent out throughout the year, but particularly just before Christmas, requests for the purchase of 2 cents' worth of lead pencils for \$1. They request the individuals to whom they send these lead pencils to send \$1 to this league in order to take care of disabled service men. They have created considerable unrest by stating in their literature that the Government and Congress is not appropriating sufficient sums of money to take care of disabled men and is not furnishing hospitalization.

Members of this House and the intelligent people of the United States know that is not true, that we have appropriated \$56,000,000 for hospitals since the war, that we are appropriating \$12,000,000 at this session of Congress, and that we are spending \$1,500,000 a day in behalf of the disabled men, and that the disabled men are getting the best treatment ever given to any body of disabled men after any war in the history of the entire world.

These gentlemen set the stage for their activities by going to Atlantic City last summer and calling a national convention of this National Disabled Soldiers' League. Of course, no soldiers belong to it, disabled or otherwise, so they put advertisements in the papers asking one-armed men, one-legged men, one-eyed men, and men who had been injured in any way to come in and act as delegates, and from among the beggars and others in New York City and adjoining large cities they gathered a fine aggregation of one-armed, one-legged, and one-eyed men for the purpose of holding their convention. None of them were disabled in the war, because the men who were disabled in the war are being taken care of by the Government. The matter was brought to the attention of the authorities at Atlantic City and they very properly ordered this organization to leave Atlantic City. But they are indulging in the very greatest of propaganda, and they are collecting, in my opinion, hundreds of thousands of dollars a year under false pretenses.

Now, gentlemen may very properly say, "Why is it the Department of Justice or the Post Office Department do not handle this?" It is an impossibility. I know of a number of Members of this House who have contributed \$1 to this organization, and in order to draw an indictment and secure a conviction it would be necessary to trace the individual contribution of \$1 through this group and show that it was not used for some disabled service man, and all that this organization must do is to expend \$100 for disabled men out of the hundreds of thousands of dollars they are collecting to avoid conviction.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I take it that every Member here is with the gentleman in his desire to protect the ex-service men from fraud or from being imposed upon, but this is not a Federal incorporation, and Congress did not incorporate it. Why, we might as well investigate all of the hundreds of other outside corporations and associations.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman did not allow me to finish my statement. Congress has incorporated the American Legion and other organizations of service men, and properly so. Many of them, perhaps, have been willing to offer their lives for the service of the country, and these service men, perhaps, stand on a little different basis than some commercial, economic, or financial organization. The object of this investigation is not only to stop these contributions and to see that no more funds are collected but also to formulate,

if possible, some law that will stop this sort of affair in the future.

If I did not think as a result of this investigation we would be able, through the aid of the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, where I think this eventually must go, to formulate some law that would protect the Government and protect the Congress and protect the charitably minded and philanthropic people of the United States, I would not wish to have this favorably acted upon, because I know that many investigations, and most investigations as conducted in Congress, do not perhaps subserve the purpose which their sponsors may desire. Some have been good, but others perhaps have not been so good.

Mr. McDUFFIE and Mr. UNDERHILL rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield first to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I wanted to find out what this investigation would cost.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, the cost of it, I would say, would probably be \$1,000 or \$2,000. As soon as this resolution would pass, it would be necessary for the chairman of this committee, who is to be appointed by the Speaker, to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, who would introduce a resolution to provide for that.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Has this matter been taken up with the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, yes; and they are in hearty sympathy with us.

Mr. McDUFFIE. If they can not punish these people now, how does this committee expect to do it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. All this committee can do is to expose this organization and then see if we can not draft some law that will make it possible for the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice to reach this outfit.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman says the Post Office Department has information that they are fraudulently collecting money.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I say the Post Office Department does not have such information as they feel certain would sustain a fraud charge. They are convinced in their own minds, but there is difficulty in tracing this dollar that you or I might contribute to them, and in case they should issue a fraud order against these gentlemen they might come in and show that they had expended \$1 as it should have been expended.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, with such information as the gentleman has and has quoted to the House regarding that convention in Atlantic City, does the gentleman mean to say that the Department of Justice or a dozen Members of this House can not draw a bill that will reach such an evil as this?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not know. I am not on the committee that is charged with drafting that law. I would say that such a bill undoubtedly could be drawn if it was called to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I may say to the gentleman that the House very readily passes these resolutions for investigations and appointing investigating committees, and then they come to the Committee on Accounts and ask for appropriations all the way from \$5,000, which I think is the least any committee has asked, up to \$50,000, and then there is involved the matter of the appropriation which the Committee on Accounts has to handle and bring before the House, and thus far I have not seen any good results from any of these committees that have been appointed during my service here.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It would appear that the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department have sufficient men who are able and have sufficient funds to follow up these contributions that are made by different people to find out what becomes of them; and if they can not do that, it would appear that it would entail considerable expense to a committee of this kind to find out what becomes of the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The Department of Justice, I may say to the gentleman, has no right to subpoena any of these gentlemen, has no right to call for their books, and has no way to get any information such as a committee of Congress can get.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am in sympathy with the purpose the gentleman sets forth in his statement here, but if the facts that the gentleman has outlined here are true, why could not any Federal grand jury in the United States, under the direction of the Attorney General, find out the facts with reference to this matter and present an indictment and prosecute these people? Does the gentleman really think that the Congress of the United States should lessen its dignity by investigating and investigating? We have already, from the gentleman's view and the view of other gentlemen, lessened our dignity by investigations. Does the gentleman think that this is in keeping with the dignity of this House, to go out and investigate a suspicion? Why not let a grand jury go into a matter of this sort?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Because I do not think there is any grand jury that could present an indictment upon the facts that can be secured and without going into their books that could be sustained under present law, and except for the fact that there is involved in this matter the question of the disabled soldier, I would not have presented it to this House.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I ask the gentleman this question: Would not the grand jury have the right to send for these books?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not think so, unless they gave the man immunity, perhaps.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Does not the gentleman think the Department of Justice could do more than we can do or than a committee of this House can do in finding out where the trouble is?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman the Department of Justice does not think so.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Do I understand it is the contention of the gentleman that this organization is conducting a nationwide fraud and that it is impossible to get evidence on which to base an indictment?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly, because you have to trace the individual dollar in order to sustain a conviction.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, I do not know about that. The Post Office Department investigates all kinds of frauds and indicts many defendants throughout the year and convicts them. I can not conceive of just what kind of concealment there is in conducting this fraud that would prevent the Post Office Department from getting the evidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman I am not authorized to speak for either the Department of Justice or the Post Office Department, but they contend there is no existing statute under which they can reach this matter; that they are in hearty sympathy with the resolution; that it is on the right track, and they desire to have the committee do what it can to develop the facts.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Are they conducting a fraudulent scheme? If they are conducting a fraudulent scheme, certainly we have laws to cover such a case.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman there are a good many fraudulent schemes where it is not possible to legally convict.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman in his capacity as a Member of the Congress has made a direct charge and a direct statement here, and if such are the facts, why can not the gentleman's committee close the thing up between now and March 4?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. What committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Or if the gentleman thinks we should have a select committee, let him strike out the words "providing that they shall sit into the next Congress and then report," and have the report made to us before March 4. The gentleman has made direct charges and has referred to positive evidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is what we want. This will be done by March 4, because except by the passage of a resolution passed by both Houses of Congress no committee can function after March 4.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And this resolution does not authorize that?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, no. It could not. It would require a resolution passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman is at the head of the Veterans' Committee. This has a peculiar and particular analogy to veterans' legislation and to the Veterans' Committee.

I have a high opinion of the men on that committee. There are some very able lawyers on it. I have enough faith in them to believe that they could draw what legislation is necessary. Then, I bring to the attention of the gentleman the fact that this organization has been at work—or a similar one has—in the city of Boston, has been conducting daisy drives and other drives, and the grand jury in the city of Boston found the evidence necessary to bring them before the bar of justice, and they have been closed out. That can be done here.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Perhaps it is one place where it has been done.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I want to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman indicates how the Veterans' Committee ought to handle this matter. In the first place, the gentleman will remember that the authority of the Veterans' Committee is so restricted that we have not the authority. If we did have it, at the present time we are drafting amendments to the Reed-Johnson law, and the entire hospital program is under consideration by a subcommittee of which the gentleman's distinguished colleague [Mr. LUCE] is the chairman. Another committee, of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] is the chairman, is at work on the personnel bill, and it will be absolutely impossible for that committee to discuss it for three or four weeks.

Mr. UNDERHILL. How about the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is one of the busiest committees in the House, and I know that it has so much work that the matter would not be discussed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Then, where are you going to get the members of this special committee if you do not take them from the Veterans' Committee and the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is a matter that the Speaker would determine. He has never had any trouble in finding members of a committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman name a State out of the 48 States of the Union that has not now a law against obtaining money under false pretenses, a good law by which you can put a man in jail when he defrauds people out of their means.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I know the gentleman is a very good lawyer, but I would like to know how the State of Alabama would have any jurisdiction if somebody in Washington writes a letter to Alabama and sends there four lead pencils and gets a dollar for them.

Mr. BLANTON. We have the Federal law against that. We have a Federal law against using the mails for the purpose of defrauding. We put the great Doctor Cook in the penitentiary for using the mails to defraud—as distinguished a man as Doctor Cook, who claimed to have discovered the North Pole.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have explained to the gentleman that because of the fact of tracing a single dollar, I do not think a conviction could be sustained.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] has told me that some of these same people were indicted and put into the penitentiary up in Boston. Why could we not obtain our facts from Boston and legislate at once? I am with the gentleman in the matter, but I would like to stop the expense of this investigation, if I could.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am not certain that it is the same organization. Some one is always originating one of these things in cities. This is a national organization.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman seems to be already in possession of the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am quoting from the testimony before the Rules Committee, not personal knowledge.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. So it seems quite unlikely that any additional facts of any particular moment will be found by this committee. It occurs to me, in view of that fact, that the chief value connected with the gentleman's resolution is for publicity, for propaganda purposes—that is, to advise the disabled veterans of the fraudulent nature of this concern. I am wondering whether the gentleman considers that it is the proper function of Congress to be carrying on that kind of an investigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that the American Legion, the Disabled American Vet-

erans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the only three organizations in the United States that really represent the veterans, having approximately a million members among them, have expended a great deal of their own money in having this investigation and producing many of these facts. They are very much interested in this, and perhaps this is where the impetus to this movement comes from, and the great object in our minds in bringing it out is to try to formulate some legislation that would protect the disabled man from exploitation in the future.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it not obvious to the gentleman that any competent member is able to draw a bill that would reach the case?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think this Congress is distinctly interested in it. The charge is made almost in so many words in a part of the stuff this organization sends out that the Congress and the United States has been negligent and has not adequately cared for the disabled veterans of the late war. That appeal is not made to the disabled, but is made to the man who has a feeling of sympathy for the disabled soldier, who spends his money and pays no further attention to it and feels that the United States Government and this Congress is not doing its duty by the service men. This is a move on the part of the service men themselves to protect the public from that sort of imposition. We can protect the service men through our organizations.

This will give, I think, if the gentleman pleases, the publicity that is necessary to reach every citizen to whom these appeals are made and stop it.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. WASON. I notice in the resolution the word "incorporated" is used.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is incorporated in New York as a philanthropic and benevolent organization.

Mr. WASON. Why should not the charter be forfeited?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say this resolution comes from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and for some reason it is said it can not be done, as they file no reports of any kind. That is what I am told; I do not know.

Mr. WASON. The gentleman is a lawyer; does he not think that an organization, if it is incorporated under the laws of the State of New York and it is conducting itself as related by him, could be reached and the charter forfeited?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There certainly should be some such provision. But I notice the American Legion lawyers state they have been unable to reach it.

Mr. WASON. Have they attempted along this line?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In every way they could I know of to put them out of business. I am not familiar with the condition in New York. The gentleman will have to ask some Member of the New York delegation.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield me five minutes time?

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the gentleman going to yield some time on this side?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman from Alabama we had no idea this would precipitate any discussion in trying to put an outfit like this out of business, and so no division of time was arranged, but the gentleman is entitled to time and I would be willing to make any arrangement he desires.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We would like a few minutes over here.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] wants five minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] five minutes, and I will give all the rest of the time to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I want five minutes on the gentleman's side.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will give the gentleman whatever time he desires. That would leave only eight minutes. Would that be sufficient? However, I will give the gentleman whatever time he wants. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the gentleman from South Dakota in submitting this matter should be asked a number of questions by Members of the House, because upon the face of it it does appear to present an anomalous and unusual situation. This was a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules, upon the facts and representations made before it when this resolution was brought here for consideration, and in order to attempt to clarify the

matter in the minds of the Members of the House I shall very briefly restate the facts appearing before the committee that led the committee to permit this resolution to be submitted for your consideration. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] introduced the resolution. He appeared before the committee with another gentleman, who was one of the executive officers, I believe, of one of the ex-service men's organizations, whose name I do not now recall. It was shown to the committee that this small coterie of men, some six or eight individuals, claimed to have organized under the laws of the State of New York this so-called National Disabled Soldiers' League (Inc.). No copy of the certificate of incorporation or charter powers of the organization was presented to the committee, so we did not know exactly what its powers are. We presumed that they were granted the usual authority granted to benevolent and eleemosynary organizations of that sort. The evidence further disclosed that these people in order to defraud the American public, especially those who are always sympathetic to the demands of the disabled ex-service men, have sent out a package of cheap lead pencils, some six in a package, with the statement that the Congress of the United States had failed to make adequate provision for the proper care of the disabled men of the country and their organization was selling these lead pencils at a dollar a package for the six—which cost about 6 cents—with the assurance that—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In a moment—that these funds would be used for the benefit of the suffering ex-service men of the country. But, as a matter of fact, it was represented to the committee that instead of doing that these men were converting those funds, amounting to many thousands of dollars, to their own individual uses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had an inquiry recently concerning an organization known as the United States Blind Veterans of the World War, incorporated in Maryland. Does the gentleman know whether or not that organization is connected with this organization which is now under consideration?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; there is no evidence tending to show any relation between them.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield, I am able to answer that question that they are not. That is an entirely separate and worthy organization.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Under the law of the State of New York they require a permit of our department of welfare to solicit funds in New York City, and if incorporated as a charitable institution they are under State supervision and, I believe, incorporated under our membership corporation law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amazing thing to me when I heard these statements of fact by a gentleman before the committee was that there was no adequate existing statute either to justify the Post Office Department or the Department of Justice in proceeding against these men for this apparent fraud in which they were using the United States mails as a vehicle to carry out their schemes.

But the gentleman from New York stated to the committee, and he was backed up in that statement by the other witness who appeared, that they had been officially informed, not only by the Post Office Department, but by the Department of Justice, that upon the statement of facts which has been presented to you this morning here, showing the method of this organization's operation, there was no statute in existence upon which they would assume the responsibility of a successful prosecution of these men in the courts. It is my personal opinion that if the Postmaster General had taken the bit in his teeth, so to speak, and issued a general fraud order against this outfit, there would have been no question as to its efficacy. But he has not done that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is not the committee as well prepared now to formulate a statute that would meet this trouble as it would be after an investigation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Which committee?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The appropriate committee, whatever it is. Could not that committee just as well frame a statute with the information on hand as with information that might be obtained from an investigation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman is well justified in coming to that conclusion. My opinion is that if these matters were drawn to the direct attention of the Committee on the Judiciary, the law committee of the House, it could make an independent investigation and probably recommend some legislation. But, gentlemen, this was a specific resolution presented to the Committee on Rules, not only for the protection of the American people against frauds of this sort,

but for the protection in a measure of the dignity of Congress, and as a remonstrance, if you want to call it that, against these accusations that have been lodged against Congress for failing adequately to take care of the disabled service men. So the Committee on Rules, on the facts presented and on the assurance given us that there was no law that covered offenses of this character, concluded that the resolution ought to be favorably reported to the House, so as to give the membership of the House full opportunity to say whether or not it was a matter of sufficient importance to justify the appointment of this special select committee charged with this duty. I think it is a matter of sufficient importance to justify the passage of the resolution. I shall vote for the resolution, as I did for the rule.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did the resolution submitted to the committee set out any basis of facts that would justify the framing of legislation? Did that complaint suggest the necessity of an investigation to secure the facts?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They proposed an investigation by this select committee to be appointed by the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; but I understood from the statement of the gentleman from Alabama and the statement of the gentleman who submitted the resolution that the facts are already known to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The facts are very largely known.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then what further knowledge would be secured to justify the appointment of a committee on which to base legislation? In other words, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] just said, have not the Members of the House sufficient knowledge of the facts to frame legislation now, without further study on the part of a committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that this could be brought to the attention of a standing committee of the House, I will say to the gentleman. But if you sought, as this resolution contemplates, to get the books and papers and the actual transactions and records of this fraudulent organization you must give authority to some committee, and you must give that authority either to the Committee on the Judiciary or to some select committee in order to enable them to compel the officers of the organization to submit the books, and compel witnesses to testify.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They can not be compelled to produce their books if those books would incriminate them. That is something that a grand jury could not do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is a mooted question, recently developed here as to a Senate investigation, which the courts must determine.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Could not better results and quicker results and more effective results be obtained by a bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the reporting by the Committee on the Judiciary of a bill supplying the present deficiency in the law?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think equally beneficial results could be obtained, as far as recommendations are concerned, for immediate legislation. But that would not meet the objections that I have just stated, namely, that it would deprive the House of the opportunity to examine witnesses under legal process. Whatever in the wisdom of the House may be the most direct and efficacious method of correcting this evil, I am willing for that to be adopted. I would have no objection to referring this to the Committee on the Judiciary, but if you wanted witnesses to appear before that committee in case it made an investigation, you must have express authority given to the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield the floor to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the gentleman from Alabama has covered the ground thoroughly. It seems to me, from as careful a study as I was able to give to the resolution, that it ought to pass by all means.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman believe that the members of the Committee on Rules ought at least to give 5 or 10 minutes of the hour to those who have reasons for opposing this resolution, in order to explain our reasons for that atti-

tude? I have not had an opportunity yet. The proponents of the resolution have used practically the time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no time in my control. Otherwise I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, how much time has been used?

The SPEAKER. Twenty-five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yielded the floor to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] first, and then to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] can have whatever time he desires.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yielded the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that perhaps I am wrong in my view on this question when I oppose the position taken by the Democratic leader on one side and my friend from South Dakota on the other side; but I want to make one or two observations. According to the testimony presented to us by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], there are two specific charges which can be brought against this organization.

One is that they have solicited contributions on the ground that Congress is not taking care of disabled veterans, a direct falsehood, and they are obtaining money under false pretenses. The other is that they have collected funds and then diverted them to their own uses. I do not know much about the law, but I should hate to take a chance myself in doing any such thing as that. I believe I could shut my eyes and place my hand upon the head of 20 Members of this House—yes; more than 20; I do not want to leave out any of them—100 Members of this House who, on the information this committee now has, could draw a bill which would provide sufficient law to reach any one of these people who are fraudulently obtaining money and who are diverting the same to their own uses.

But what I want to say particularly regarding this special committee is this: Perhaps some of you know about it. It comes to me every time you pass a resolution providing for a special committee. The Speaker chooses good men, and I know I would have no criticism of the personnel of such a committee. The first thing is to appear before the Committee on Accounts and ask for an appropriation out of the contingent fund of this House for carrying on the work of the special committee. In the first place, every one of these special committees wants a clerk. The clerk, of course, does a great deal of work for all of these committees. Then they put in an item for travel, not only for themselves but an item for travel of witnesses who may be summoned; then they must have stenographers and typewriters; then they must go outside of this body and hire legal talent; then they must have money for summonses and all that sort of thing.

Now, it probably did not come to the attention of the Committee on Rules that in the State of Massachusetts there was this organization or a similar organization, headed by a man named Burns. He was conducting what they called daisy drives and also sending out these fraudulent statements. The grand jury or the Attorney General or the district attorney or some other duly constituted authority arrested that man and two others, and they were brought before the court, tried, convicted, and sentenced for doing just exactly what the committee claims this organization is doing. I would suggest that you get in communication with the authorities in Massachusetts and find out how they did it, and under what process of law they accomplished what you are trying to do through a special investigation, and then pass a law before we leave here on the 4th of March that will reach these fellows and put them in jail, where they belong, without the attendant expense of a special committee and without the attendant bother, nuisance, trouble, and work on the part of such special committees.

Referring to the question I asked my friend, he said the Veterans' Committee was too busy to attend to it, so consequently all the members of that committee are too busy; the Judiciary Committee is too busy to attend to it, consequently that eliminates all the members of the Judiciary Committee; and I say in behalf of the Committee on Claims that it is too busy to attend to it; probably all House committees are just as busy, so I do not know where you are going to get the personnel for this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if this were a Federal corporation there would be some reason, possibly, for this resolution, but we have plenty of law now, both national and State, to handle this very situation.

When is this special committee investigation and expense to end? Our friend from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is now the chairman of a special committee in behalf of the veterans, and how much has he spent up to this time? Here are the figures given me by the Clerk of the House: Up to this date he has spent \$8,796.72 out of our contingent fund in the investigations he has made already.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman to yield there. The gentleman does not mean that the chairman of the committee has spent \$6,000?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I mean his committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. He means that the 21 members of the Veterans' Committee, in accordance with the authority given by this Congress to investigate the condition of hospitals over the country—

Mr. BLANTON. Please do not use all of my time, as it is very limited.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will yield the gentleman additional time. The Veterans' Committee, in accordance with the authority given by this Congress to investigate the condition of hospitals over the country, has formed six special committees and sent them over the United States to determine the treatment and hospital care and medical care now being given to disabled veterans of the late war. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas one more minute.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Speaker, that leaves me how much time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, with the gentleman's explanation, his committee has spent already out of the contingent fund of the House, in addition to the regular annual committee expenditures, \$8,796.72.

Now, let me show you what some of the other special committees have spent. The committee now investigating Judge Baker has spent \$1,600; the committee investigating alleged Indian frauds has already spent on the matter now pending before it \$5,000; the special committee on bonds has already spent \$7,000; the special committee on the Shipping Board has already spent \$14,000; the special committee on aircraft has already spent \$18,000; and I happen to remember what some of the other special committees spent. I can not forget that the Graham committee, for which most of you Members voted, spent \$151,000; that the Joe Walsh committee, that went to the Pacific coast—and the gentleman under this resolution could go there if he wanted to if you should appoint this committee and if he were chairman of it, he could go to the Pacific coast—the Joe Walsh committee went there on a special train and lived on a special train on the Pacific coast, and they spent \$40,000; the Anderson committee spent \$42,000; and I could mention others leading up as high as the special coal commission that spent \$600,000. Where is it all going to end?

We already have the information sought by this resolution; we already have the law; every State in this Nation, 48 of them, now has laws against procuring money under false pretenses, and offenders could be prosecuted under the State law. We have Federal laws sufficient to prevent the use of the United States mails for fraudulent purposes.

The gentleman said the mails are being used by this organization. If they are being used fraudulently, they can be put in the penitentiary under the present law.

I am just as good a friend of the service man as my friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am working for them constantly. They call on me from every part of the country to help get their claims adjudicated. I do not turn them down.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I keep my office busy submitting their claims to the Veterans' Bureau all the time for adjudication, and I am doing everything I can to help them; but I am not willing to continue to spend thousands of dollars on these special committees.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I have just found out I may say for the benefit of the gentleman and the House, that the cases I spoke of in Boston were tried in the Federal courts and Federal convictions were secured. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, gentlemen, we ought to stop appointing these expensive special committees. None have accomplished anything in my judgment. We ought to stop this traveling and these expense accounts that are being paid out of our contin-

gent fund. We ought to use the regular committees of the House. The gentleman has a splendid personnel on his committee, and the 21 Members who constitute his committee now can furnish us the facts without the expenditure of further funds.

I have confidence in the gentleman sufficient to convince me that he can give us every fact, and I believe in his ability as a lawyer. He is a splendid lawyer. He has been a distinguished prosecuting attorney. The gentleman can draw a bill right now providing a new law, if one is needed, that will meet this situation. Let us all use wise judgment and save this money in the Public Treasury.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this discussion, but I think the Members should get clearly just what the situation is that has induced the Committee on Rules—some members of which at least are very careful about investigations; certainly none more careful than the chairman—to report this particular resolution.

I do not propose to prejudge the organization which has caused the introduction of this resolution, because I do not know what the facts are; but I do know what the allegations are.

The allegations are not that this organization is injuring the service men. This is not primarily a proposition to protect service men. The allegations are that this organization, incorporated, as I understand it, as a charity organization under the laws of the State of New York, is sending out to the public generally lead pencils with a request that the person receiving the letter containing the pencils purchase them by remitting \$1 to the senders and holding out the idea that the fund so received is to be used for the benefit of disabled soldiers; and the allegation is further that the funds so received are not being used in any considerable degree for the benefit of disabled soldiers, but that they are being diverted to the pockets of those who organized the concern.

I have not talked with the Post Office Department about it, and I have not talked with the Department of Justice about it. I have not time to go to the departments about all these things. I have accepted the statement made before the Committee on Rules by gentlemen whose sole interest in this matter seemed to be the protection of the public against what were alleged to be improper, and probably fraudulent, methods. But I understand that the Post Office Department, after an investigation extending, I think some one said, before the Committee on Rules over a period of 18 months has not found itself justified, in its opinion, in issuing a fraud order. They hesitate about issuing fraud orders, and they should hesitate about issuing them.

I understand, further, that the Department of Justice, whose attention was called to it long ago, has made an investigation and has been unable to ascertain facts upon which it could predicate an indictment under existing law.

Furthermore, these letters that go forth, or some of them in the past—I have a recollection, I think, quite distinct that I myself received a letter from this concern a long while ago, or some similar concern; I do not know that it was the same one, and my first impulse was to return it with the small amount asked for, but when I glanced over the letter I saw where the clear intimation, which admitted of no other conclusion, was thrown out in that letter, that the Congress had failed to do its duty in providing for disabled soldiers. Of course, I knew that was not so, and my suspicions were easily aroused, and I threw it aside and gave it no further attention.

You note that this resolution is tied up with legislation. This is not a resolution merely to bring about an exposure, but the committee is specifically instructed to consider the question, if they can not be reached under existing law and their practices are wrong, and determine whether or not a statute can be drawn under which they can be reached and their practices and the practices of any similar organizations that may spring up be checked in the future by force of law, which the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department say can not now be done.

I think it is of sufficient importance to merit the passage of this resolution, and hence gave it my support in committee and shall support it here.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Conceding all the allegations to be as stated in the resolution and as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, the question that arises in the minds of some of the Members is this: Assuming the allegations to be true and assuming the conditions to be true as stated, why not pass legislation at once meeting those conditions; and if they do not

exist, your legislation will be harmless; but if they do exist, then you have met the situation long before your special committee would have the time to make its report, which could not possibly be before the adjournment of this Congress, and then we could not take it up before next December?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the report as to the facts can be made before the close of this Congress; the report will have to be made before the close of this Congress, because the committee will die along with the Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. That is true; but it will be impossible to pass legislation in connection with it during this Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me say this to the gentleman; I think there is not now a sufficient knowledge of the details of their operations. I confess I do not have such knowledge. I simply know these general allegations, but they are so serious in their nature—that is, that in the name of the soldiers, and the disabled soldiers at that, these people are alleged to be preying not only upon soldiers but upon the public as a whole—I think we ought to know sufficient of the details of the practice, if the allegations are found to be true, that the matter can be clearly defined in a statute.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Knowing something of this organization, will the gentleman permit me to say in his time that not one of the half dozen so-called disabled veterans who divide these spoils was ever disabled overseas, and I cordially support the Democratic leader in his position.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat in a quandary. I have great respect for the gentleman who brings in this resolution, and I have great respect for the thoughtful, wise leader of the minority; but have they made out a case? I would like to vote for anything that professes to protect and help the disabled soldier, naturally, but let us see where we are. It is charged that these men have made false representations, and that through those false representations they have procured money. Are those the facts? I ask members of the committee if that is the fact; and, further, that those false representations upon which were procured money went through the mails. Is that the fact? You nod your assent. Do you mean to tell me that you have no law to punish that? I am not much of a lawyer, but I can draw three indictments on those facts.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Suppose it is shown that everything is as has been stated here this morning, so far as the facts are concerned; then what legislation does the gentleman think we could enact in addition to legislation already on the statute books that would meet the offense?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know, and I can not hear of any. Are gentlemen afraid that the country will be misled into thinking that we are neglecting the disabled soldier? I think we have convinced this country that we are not; and some people accuse us of raiding the Treasury and of being demagogues in our interest in the disabled veteran. Are you going to have an investigating committee every time somebody lies about Congress? If you are, then you will not have time to do anything else.

One of the leading dailies in my district recently published an editorial—and the same editorial appeared in 17 other papers, a canned editorial sent out from Washington—that contained a willful, deliberate lie about Congress. In my first heat of passion I sat down and wrote an indignant letter to that editor, but fortunately I have a secretary who is very wise. He has a cooling box for my indignant letters. I wrote the letter yesterday and this morning I tore it up. Neither the Congress nor any individual Member of Congress can afford to take all of its and his time to answer willful, deliberate falsehoods circulated up and down this land. I may be wrong, and I am not reflecting on the investigations made heretofore, but the American people, according to my notion, are heartily sick and tired of our investigating things that an ordinary grand jury ought to investigate. [Applause.]

If your facts are true, why do you not go down here and demand of the district attorney that these men be indicted? You say you have the documentary evidence. If he will not do his duty, then why not go to President Coolidge and insist that he remove the District attorney and give us one who will prosecute men who cheat helpless, disabled soldiers and in their name fleece the people of the land? If your statement of fact is true, you have plenty of law, and what you need

is not an investigation but an enforcement of the existing statutes. I submit that the enforcement of the criminal laws is the province of the administrative and judicial branches of the Government and is not for an investigation by the legislative branch.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the gentleman that the chief justification for the passage of this resolution is the assumption that there is no adequate law under which you can convict these men if they are guilty of the charges made. When the Attorney General of the United States and the law-enforcement officers of the Post Office Department solemnly assert that there is no such law, then it brings the matter squarely up to us.

Mr. WINGO. I differ with the gentleman. I saw the letter. I hesitated whether I would send it to the Department of Justice. If the facts stated are true, you can indict them in every State in the Union, and if there is no statute under which you can indict them then the gentleman is a good enough lawyer to draw a common-law indictment. It is admitted that they obtained money under false pretenses. My God! have the judiciary and the courts of this land fallen to such a low estate that criminals who prey in the name of the disabled soldiers are not brought to book? If so, then something is wrong, and it does not lie within the compass of our duty unless we proceed by impeachment. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman who says it is so easy to draw five or six indictments in this matter, that no indictment can be drawn in my own opinion and a conviction secured unless you can trace the individual dollar contributed by some person and show that it is misappropriated. If \$100,000 were fraudulently collected and it can be shown that \$10 were used for some one wounded soldier, you never can secure a conviction. We members of the Rules Committee do not present the facts of this matter of our own knowledge. We have given to this House the testimony that has been given by witnesses before the Committee on Rules. We do not represent the Department of Justice nor do we represent the Post Office Department, but we have been assured by those departments, who ought to know more about their own business than somebody discussing it on the outside, that they can not reach the situation as it now stands. We have presented the facts to the House. If the House decides it knows more about the matter than do those departments, and more about drawing indictments and prosecutions than the Attorney General, then we have nothing more to say.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 71, noes 66.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that there is no quorum present and object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 106, not voting 167, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—158

Abernethy	Clague	Gardner, Ind.	Lampert
Allen	Clarke, N. Y.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lanham
Andrew	Cleary	Garrett, Tex.	Lazaro
Aswell	Cole, Iowa	Gibson	Leatherwood
Ayres	Collier	Green	Leavitt
Bacon	Colton	Greenwood	Lilly
Bankhead	Connery	Griest	Longworth
Barkley	Cooper, Ohio	Hadley	Luce
Beers	Crowther	Hardy	McSwain
Begg	Darrow	Hawes	MacLafferty
Bixler	Davey	Hawley	Madden
Black, Tex.	Davis, Minn.	Hayden	Magee, N. Y.
Bland	Davis, Tenn.	Hickey	Mapes
Bloom	Denison	Howard, Nebr.	Martin
Boles	Doughton	Humphreys	Michener
Browne, N. J.	Dowell	James	Miller, Ill.
Browne, Wis.	Elliott	Jeffers	Miller, Wash.
Browning	Evans, Mont.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Minahan
Brumm	Fairfield	Kearns	Mooney
Bulwinkle	Fish	Keller	Morgan
Burness	Fitzgerald	Kelly	Murphy
Byrnes, S. C.	Fleetwood	Kerr	Newton, Minn.
Byrns, Tenn.	French	Ketcham	O'Connell, R. I.
Cable	Frothingham	Kincheloe	Oldfield
Campbell	Gallivan	Knutson	Oliver, N. Y.
Christopherson	Garber	Kurtz	Patterson

Perkins	Sinclair	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Purnell	Sinnot	Tilson	Wilson, Ind.
Quin	Smith	Treadway	Wilson, Miss.
Ragon	Snell	Underwood	Winslow
Raker	Speaks	Upshaw	Winter
Rathbone	Stalker	Vaile	Wood
Rayburn	Stedman	Vincent, Mich.	Woodruff
Reece	Stengle	Voigt	Woodrum
Reid, Ill.	Strong, Kans.	Wainwright	Wurzbach
Salmon	Strong, Pa.	Watson	Wyant
Sandlin	Swing	Weaver	Yates
Scott	Taylor, Colo.	White, Kans.	Zihlman
Shreve	Taylor, Tenn.	Williams, Tex.	
Simmons	Thomas, Ky.	Williamson	

NAYS—106

Ackerman	Penn	Lozier	Romjue
Aldrich	Fulbright	McClintic	Rubey
Allgood	Gasque	McKeown	Sabath
Arnold	Gifford	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Tex.
Barbour	Harrison	McReynolds	Schneider
Beck	Hastings	McSweeney	Sears, Fla.
Bell	Hersey	MacGregor	Sherwood
Blanton	Hill, Ala.	Major, Ill.	Sites
Bowling	Hill, Wash.	Major, Mo.	Sprout, Kans.
Box	Hooker	Mansfield	Stegall
Boyce	Howard, Okla.	Merritt	Stephens
Brand, Ga.	Huddleston	Montague	Stevenson
Brand, Ohio	Hudson	Moore, Ga.	Summers, Wash.
Buchanan	Hudspeth	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Busby	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Swank
Butler	Hull, Morton D.	Morehead	Taber
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Morrow	Thatcher
Chindblom	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, Me.	Thomas, Okla.
Connally, Tex.	Jones	Oliver, Ala.	Tucker
Cooper, Wis.	King	Park, Ga.	Underhill
Crisp	Kvale	Parks, Ark.	Wason
Crosser	LaGuardia	Peery	Watkins
Dickinson, Iowa	Lankford	Ramseyer	Wefald
Dickinson, Mo.	Larsen, Ga.	Rankin	Wingo
Drane	Lehibach	Reed, Ark.	Wright
Drewry	Lineberger	Robinson, Iowa	
Dyer	Lowrey	Robison, Ky.	

NOT VOTING—167

Almon	Favrot	Lindsay	Roach
Anderson	Fisher	Linthicum	Rogers, Mass.
Anthony	Foster	Logan	Rogers, N. H.
Bacharach	Frear	Lyon	Rosenbloom
Beedy	Fredericks	McDuffie	Rouse
Berger	Free	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Black, N. Y.	Freeman	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Boylan	Fuller	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Schafer
Briggs	Fulmer	McLeod	Schall
Britten	Funk	McNulty	Sears, Nebr.
Buckley	Gambrill	Magee, Pa.	Seger
Burdick	Garner, Tex.	Manlove	Shallenberger
Burton	Geran	Mead	Smithwick
Canfield	Gilbert	Michaelson	Snyder
Carew	Glatfelter	Milligan	Spearing
Carter	Goldsbrough	Mills	Sprout, Ill.
Casey	Graham	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Celler	Griffin	Moore, Ohio	Sweet
Clancy	Guyer	Morin	Swoope
Clark, Fla.	Hall	Morris	Tague
Cole, Ohio	Hammer	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, W. Va.
Collins	Haugen	Newton, Mo.	Temple
Connolly, Pa.	Hill, Md.	Nolan	Thompson
Cook	Hoch	O'Brien	Timberlake
Corning	Holaday	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tincher
Cramton	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor, La.	Tinkham
Croll	Hull, William E.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Tydings
Cullen	Jacobstein	O'Sullivan	Vare
Cummings	Johnson, Ky.	Palge	Vestal
Curry	Johnson, W. Va.	Parker	Vinson, Ga.
Dallinger	Jost	Peavey	Vinson, Ky.
Deal	Kendall	Perlman	Ward, N. Y.
Dempsey	Kent	Phillips	Ward, N. C.
Dickstein	Kiess	Porter	Watres
Dominick	Kindred	Pou	Weller
Doyle	Kopp	Prall	Welsh
Driver	Kunz	Quayle	Wertz
Eagan	Langley	Rainey	White, Me.
Edmonds	Larson, Minn.	Ransley	Williams, Ill.
Evans, Iowa	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Mich.
Fairchild	Leach	Reed, W. Va.	Wolff
Faust	Lee, Ga.	Richards	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Vare with Mr. Jost.
 Mr. Faust with Mr. McDuffie.
 Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Prall.
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Pou.
 Mr. Manlove with Mr. Almon.
 Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Sears of Nebraska with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Driver.
 Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Vinson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Hoch with Mr. Tydings.
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
 Mr. Cramton with Mr. Milligan.
 Mr. Wertz with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Logan.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Hammer.
 Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Vinson of Georgia.
 Mr. Beedy with Mr. Smithwick.
 Mr. Haugen with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Burdick with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Lea of California.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Mead.
 Mr. Kopp with Mr. Clark of Florida.
 Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Cook.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Berger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR
APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11753. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11753, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11753, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing overcrowding of passenger vessels: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to employ, temporarily, such persons as may be necessary, of whom not more than two at any one time may be employed in the District of Columbia, to enforce the laws to prevent overcrowding of passenger and excursion vessels, and all expenses in connection therewith, \$17,920.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 61, in line 8, I move to strike out the words "in the District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: On page 61, line 8, after the word "employed," strike out "in the District of Columbia."

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, if you will give me your attention for just half a minute, if you will call at the Sergeant at Arms' office he will give you a metal tag to place on your automobiles that will assist you in finding a parking place down town when you go to the various Government buildings on official business. I just wanted to let you know they are at the Sergeant at Arms' office. They have been furnished by the District of Columbia. They are not transferable, and may be used on no car other than your own. If you get them it may help you to find parking places.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Would it not be well to say in connection with the gentleman's statement that this does not give to Congress any privileges which are not now enjoyed by the ordinary citizen, except an opportunity to park near some of the public buildings?

Mr. BLANTON. That is a fact. It is merely an identification tag, and gives to us no privilege additional to that we now have. It does not permit you to speed down the streets any more than any other citizen. It does not permit you to park near water plugs. It does not permit you to violate the law in any respect, but is simply to enable you to find a parking place when you go down town on official business. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk hire: For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce, to each person or clerk in the offices of shipping commissioners, \$89,040.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A few days ago I addressed the House calling the Members' attention to the fact I might offer an amendment for the aid of navigation, as the amount has been cut down to something like \$200,000 or \$300,000. Those remarks appear in the RECORD of day before yesterday and show that the Secretary, a Cabinet member, asked for \$517,700, but the Director of the Budget did not see fit to grant that amount. From the sum appropriated there will not be a sufficient amount adequately to take care of the seventh naval district. It will simply be impossible, however much the department may desire to do so, to provide the necessary aids to navigation. I say this in justice to the department because the department by its report showed they wanted to assist and aid navigation in

every way possible, but it seems we can not get the money. I shall not at this time offer an amendment, which I said in my remarks the other day I might offer, because yesterday having listened to the able address of one of my colleagues when he tried to get through an amendment to this bill, realizing that he being a member of the Committee on Appropriations—and the Appropriations Committee was divided among themselves as to the merit of the amendment—that if he could not succeed, certainly it would be useless for me to try. I am satisfied that some Members are now beginning to realize the force of my remarks when I said the other day I had met my Waterloo, and that now there was no use in fighting and wasting our energies; therefore I will not at this time offer the amendment. I only hope and trust that the committee next year, when the Secretary, a Cabinet member, requests an amount that is absolutely necessary to be appropriated properly to take care of a certain item, will see that the amount goes into the bill, and I also hope that the Director of the Budget will grant the request and see that the proper amount is submitted to the Appropriations Committee.

I withdraw the proforma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Metallurgical research: For metallurgical research, including alloy steels, foundry practice, and standards for metals and sands; casting, rolling, forging, and the properties of aluminum alloys; prevention of corrosion of metals and alloys; development of metal substitutes, as for platinum; behavior of bearing metals; preparation of metal specifications; investigation of new metallurgical processes and study of methods of conservation in metallurgical manufacture and products; investigation of materials used in the construction of rails, wheels, axles, and other railway equipment, and the cause of their failure; including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$43,140, of which amount not to exceed \$40,080 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. The gentleman does not expect to vote on this bill this afternoon, does he?

Mr. SHREVE. We would really like to run along a while, but I assume that possibly we can not vote this afternoon. I think I can say we will not attempt to reach a vote this afternoon.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman will endeavor to complete the bill, but he does not expect a vote this afternoon?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, this is Saturday afternoon; will the gentleman give us a little rest?

Mr. SHREVE. At what time?

Mr. BLANTON. At 4.15.

Mr. SHREVE. All right.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For supplies, repairs, maintenance, and incidental expenses of lighthouses and other lights, beacons, buoyage, fog signals, lighting of rivers heretofore authorized to be lighted, light vessels, other aids to navigation, and lighthouse tenders, including the establishment, repair, and improvement of beacons and day marks, and purchase of land for same; establishment of post lights, buoys, submarine signals, and fog signals; establishment of oil or carbide houses, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That any oil or carbide house erected hereunder shall not exceed \$1,000 in cost; construction of necessary outbuildings at a cost not exceeding \$500 at any one light station in any fiscal year; improvement of grounds and buildings connected with light stations and depots; restoring light stations and depots and buildings connected therewith: *Provided further*, That such restoration shall be limited to the original purpose of the structures; wages of persons attending post lights; temporary employees and field force while engaged on works of general repair and maintenance, and laborers and mechanics at lighthouse depots; rations and provisions or commutation thereof for working parties in the field, officers and crews of light vessels and tenders, and officials and other authorized persons of the Lighthouse Service on duty on board of such tenders or vessels, and money accruing from commutation for rations and provisions for the above-named persons on board of tenders and light vessels or in working parties in the field may be paid on proper vouchers to the person having charge of the mess of such vessel or party; purchase of rubber boots, oilskins, rubber gloves, and coats, caps, and aprons for stewards' departments on vessels; reimbursement under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce of keepers of light stations and masters of light vessels and of lighthouse tenders for rations and provisions and clothing furnished shipwrecked persons who may be temporarily provided for by them, not exceeding in all \$5,000 in any fiscal year; fuel and rent of quarters

where necessary for keepers of lighthouses; purchase of land sites for fog signals; rent of necessary ground for all such lights and beacons as are for temporary use or to mark changeable channels and which in consequence can not be made permanent; rent of offices, depots, and wharves; traveling expenses; mileage; library books for light stations and vessels, and technical books and periodicals not exceeding \$1,000; traveling and subsistence expenses of teachers while actually employed by States or private persons to instruct the children of keepers of lighthouses; all other contingent expenses of district offices and depots, \$4,031,000.

The CHAIRMAN. On line 14 of page 54 the word "boats" should be changed to "boots." Without objection, the change will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] a question. The gentleman from Illinois is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and knows all about these appropriations. I want to call his attention to a statement in this morning's Washington Post, as follows:

LORD TO TOUR NATION, LECTURING ON BUDGET

Aims and practices of the Bureau of the Budget were outlined by Brig. Gen. Herbert M. Lord, its director, in an address before the Harvard Club of Washington at its meeting last night at the University Club.

He told the club that the Budget is a common-sense system applied to the business of the United States, but that frequently its purposes are misunderstood. For this reason he will leave next month on a series of tours through the northeastern and midwestern sections of the country delivering 20 lectures on the Budget. After March 4 he will make more extensive tours, he said.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that an advertisement, or a statement by the editor of the paper?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. It is a news item. Is there any appropriation carried in these bills to pay the Director of the Budget for expenses incurred on these lecture tours?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is it a part of the duty of the Director of the Budget Bureau to deliver lectures to the people on the Budget instead of attending to his business?

Mr. MADDEN. There is nothing on that in the law, so far as I know. There is no appropriation for that.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What are the gentleman's views as to the propriety of that?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to answer categorically as to anything stated in a newspaper without knowledge as to how it got into the paper, or whether it is true or not.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. It is in the Washington Post.

Mr. MADDEN. I would not feel free to take, without some reservation, the word of any paper at this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Illinois is one of the chief proponents of this budget system. Does he think that it is any part of that system to carry on these lecture tours throughout the country, to discredit Congress, and build up a body of popular opinion favorable to the Budget Bureau?

Mr. MADDEN. I would not like to subscribe to the statements made by my good friend from Texas, whether the lectures are to be delivered by Mr. Lord to discredit Congress, or to applaud Congress, or to exploit the budget system, or to acquaint the people with the facts concerning the institution. I would have to know about each one of those four or five things he was going to do, and without that knowledge I would not want to express an opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman does not need to brag about the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MADDEN. No. Our work speaks for itself.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman's committee usually cuts the estimates of the Budget, and it used to cut the estimates of the executive departments of the Government before there was a Budget.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to my friend from Texas, than whom there is no better Member of Congress, that the aggregate of appropriations since the Budget system went into effect, in round figures, is \$330,000,000 lower than the Budget recommendations. I am happy to be able to make that statement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing magnetic observations and to establish meridian lines in connection therewith in all parts of the United States; magnetic observations in other regions under the jurisdiction of the United States; purchase of additional magnetic instruments; lease of sites where necessary and erection of temporary magnetic buildings; continuing the line of exact levels between the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts; establishing lines of exact levels in Alaska; determination of geographical positions by triangulation or traverse for the control of Federal, State, boundary, and other surveys and engineering works in all parts of the interior of the United States and Alaska; determination of field astronomic positions; for continuing gravity observations; for the maintenance and operation of the latitude observatory at Ukiah, Calif., not exceeding \$2,000; and including the employment in the field and office of such magnetic observers as may be necessary, \$128,735.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have carefully followed the provisions of this bill. As to the remarks that I may make in the few minutes allotted to me perhaps some gentleman in the committee may think that they are not entirely pertinent to the subject matter of the section. But I ask your forbearance and patience, with the assurance that I probably shall not consume even the five minutes.

This morning a very large portion of the people of the United States were permitted to experience the sight of a great natural phenomenon that comes but a few times in a century. As I looked here in the city of Washington at the eclipse of the sun this morning, I thought of those lines by Lord Byron, which for the first time in my life I fancied may have been inspired by just such an exhibition. When in a few moments the pall of night, with its chill and darkness, settled down over a large portion of our country, I was impressed with these lines:

I had a dream that was not all a dream.
The bright sun was extinguished, and the stars
Did wander darkly in the eternal space,
Rayless and pathless, and the icy earth
Swung blind and blackening in the moonless air.
Morn came and went, and came, and brought no day;
And men forgot their passions in the dread of this their desolation.

[Applause.]

I shall insert as a part of my remarks newspaper clippings concerning the scientific and other phases of the eclipse:

ECLIPSE REUNION GATHERS VETERANS OF 1869 PHENOMENA

[By the Associated Press]

LESUEUR CENTER, MINN., January 24.—An eclipse reunion was held here to-day by a number of pioneers who saw the eclipse of 1869. Recalling the terror caused by the eclipse of 55 years ago, Thomas Dewire said that when it appeared between 3 and 4 p. m., August 7, 1869, he saw persons running for safety.

There was only curiosity to-day.

[By the Associated Press]

LAKEHURST, N. J., January 24.—Jubilant because of the apparent success of their venture to observe and photograph from aloft the phenomena of a solar eclipse, the group of scientists who to-day witnessed the eclipse from the dirigible *Los Angeles* to-night were enthusiastically describing the beauty of the spectacle. Like a group of excited schoolboys, they recited their adventure in the simple words of the layman.

"When you can adequately describe celestial glory, then you will have told what this eclipse looked like," was the way Capt. Edward T. Pollock, Superintendent of the Naval Observatory at Washington, described it.

"A most spectacular sight," Commander J. H. Klein, jr., commander of the *Los Angeles*, said: "The sky at the horizon was a flood of merging orange and red light. Overhead the ceiling was blue-black, while all about was the darkness of twilight."

While the success of the expedition will not be known definitely until the photographic plates exposed during the eclipse have been developed and studied at the Naval Observatory, every member of the scientific group expressed confidence that he had obtained some discovery concerning the elements of a solar eclipse.

Dr. C. C. Keiss, of the Bureau of Standards, who operated the spectroscope aboard the observation car, said he had obtained three pictures of rings of hydrogen and helium gases emanating from the sun, which will be developed and studied for possible scientific revelations.

Capt. C. S. Litell, of the Naval Observatory, said he reckoned the flashes sent off from the sun's corona to be one and one-half times the diameter of the sun itself, or 1,700,000 miles in length. He witnessed also, he said, several sun spots which he expected would show up on the pictures taken.

[From Associated Press]

Saturday, January 24.—Dreams of astronomers of seeing a total eclipse of the sun under ideal conditions were realized to-day in New York and New England. In Michigan, at Niagara Falls, N. Y., and in Ontario, Canada, however, clouds and low visibility frustrated scientific tests.

Especially in New York City, witnessing its first total eclipse in 119 years, was the spectacle magnificent. Excellent scientific observations were made by home and visiting scientists at Cornell and Yale, almost in the center of the totality area, and also aboard the Navy dirigible *Los Angeles*. The airship named for the angels hovered over the island of Nantucket, Mass., and sent word by radio through the heavens that the results of its trip were excellent.

First reports of the results of scientific tests concerned the radio, and were from Yerkes Observatory, from Iron Mountain, Mich., where a slight increase in volume and clarity of the radio was noted.

At Waterbury, Conn., a marked departure from direction of the tone was apparent. The Radio Corporation of America in New York City reported that its tests showed that a short wave length follows the sun and that static is not entirely a local condition.

The eclipse averaged four seconds later than the astronomers had calculated. It was five seconds behind schedule at Cornell, three seconds at Vassar, and five seconds at Yale.

A rapidly vanishing streak of darkness was daubed over 40,000 square miles of the most densely populated section of the United States.

In the path of the celestial shadow brush there were this morning for the first time in their modern aspects the largest city in the country, much of the Empire State, parts of eight other States—Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island—and part of the great Canadian Province of Ontario.

The solar eclipse affected the activities of more than 10,000,000 people living in this totality area, with an hour of daylight being succeeded by twilight, a few moments of darkness, then twilight and daylight again. The phenomenon was not greeted by terror, as was the wont of the untutored ancients, but with enthusiasm for nature's greatest spectacle, where clouds did not blot out a view of the eclipse.

BUSTLE OF BUSINESS HALTED

The bustle of business was deferred for a sight of celestial wonders and study of the cosmos that are mysterious in many respects, despite the progress of science.

The moon's shadow, about 100 miles wide, swept eastward in a curve from Minnesota to the Atlantic Ocean, blackening such places as Toronto, Canada; Buffalo, Niagara Falls, with its frozen cataract; Rochester, N. Y.; Scranton, Pa.; Paterson, N. J.; half of New York City; New Haven, Hartford, and New London, Conn.; Newport, R. I.; New Bedford and Nantucket, Mass.

Across the Atlantic it moved to disappear into space at a point near the Shetland Islands, after streaking the earth for 3,000 miles.

Two minutes was the longest time any one city was covered, yet to an observer in the far heavens, with vision strong enough, were such a thing possible, the drawing of the black mark would last 1 hour and 43 minutes.

There was about 95 per cent totality in Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Washington, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Toledo, Ottawa, and Montreal, but only those in the totality area had the opportunity to witness the greatest glories of the eclipse, the halo, beads of light, and shadow bands at the moment of totality of the sun.

NEW YORK CITY.—When the momentary blackness of midnight at 9.11 a. m. was accompanied by the beautiful sight of the corona there was enthusiasm. Watchers on skyscrapers and hilltops applauded and cheered.

COOLIDGE IS OBSERVER

President Coolidge witnessed the partial eclipse on the lawn of the White House, looking through a blackened window pane which he carried.

Scientific observations were characterized as the most successful ever made by Dr. E. E. Free, who headed a party at East Hampton, Long Island.

The weather bureau at Cornell noted a drop of 1.3° in the temperature. A drop of 2° was reported at Yonkers.

Shadow bands were noted at Yale one minute before and one minute after totality. Jupiter, Mercury, and Venus were clear at Yale, but no comet was seen.

Nearly 3 miles up in the air an Army plane from Mitchel Field, Long Island, took 12 pictures of the racing shadow.

VIEWED FROM ABOVE CLOUDS

Aboard naval dirigible *Los Angeles*, en route from Nantucket, Mass., January 24.—(By wireless to the Associated Press.)—Lifted a mile closer to the sun by the Navy dirigible *Los Angeles*, the United States Naval Observatory astronomers had a perfect view of the total solar eclipse. During the two minutes four and six-tenths seconds of totality not a cloud marred the magnificent spectacle of the sun completely blotted out by the moon.

The ghostly radiance of the eclipsed sun turned the ocean, horizon, and the clouds below into a vivid picture in yellow, purple, and gray, while observers made pictures of the corona for science. A battery of four astronomical cameras secured 18 photographs, and two motion-picture cameras and a spectrograph were in operation. The latter instrument recorded the spectrum lines of helium gas which holds the *Los Angeles* aloft. Hydrogen, which helium superseded, was also recorded, since both helium and hydrogen occur in the outer layers of the sun.

DROP IN TEMPERATURE

It will be several weeks before it is determined before any new science has been discovered. The bands were not pronounced. Apparently no comet was seen according to the information received here, Professor Brown said, in the exchange of telegrams by the scientific observers stationed at various points. Middletown reported great success, East Hampton reported perfect conditions for color photographs, and Buffalo said the color effects were beautiful.

Poughkeepsie reported streamers of unusual shape.

Ithaca reported a drop of five degrees in temperature during totality and said that clouds which obscured the sun cleared away a moment before totality.

SUCCESSFUL AT YALE

NEW HAVEN, CONN., January 24.—Astronomers at the Yale observatory reported conditions of observation of the eclipse to be excellent. All plans are working to perfection, they said. Hundreds of persons gathered about the observatory grounds but were prevented by police from interfering with the expert observers.

At the period of total obscurity, the sun's corona and the brilliant streamers were plainly visible both at the Yale observatory and throughout this section.

SUCCESSFUL DESPITE CLOUDS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 24.—Visual and photographic work carried out at the Harvard observatory in connection with to-day's eclipse of the sun, were successful in spite of slightly cloudy conditions in the later stages of the eclipse, officials at the observatory announced.

From this point of observation, the eclipse obscured 99 per cent of the diameter of the sun.

OBSERVATIONS AT CORNELL

ITHACA, N. Y., January 24.—The eclipse of the sun was observed by scientists at Cornell University here to-day under conditions they described as ideal. The eclipse was total here from 9.08.40 until 9.10.20.

MOUNTAINS OF GAS

NEW YORK, January 24.—Prof. B. G. Taylor, making telescopic observations at the College of the City of New York, said that at totality he observed mountains of gas boiling up from the corona to a height of 1,000,000 miles, and that the contour of the corona was continually changing.

PRECISELY AS PREDICTED

BRONX, N. Y., January 24 (by the Associated Press).—The two-ring celestial circus—a total eclipse of the sun—was successfully performed in all its brilliant glory at 9.11 a. m. to-day precisely as astronomers predicted it would.

Not a cloud screened the passing of the moon before the sun's disk, and all the attendant phenomena—Bailey's beads, the shadow band, and the pearly corona—were observed by thousands who filled the streets and housetops in the northern section of the metropolis.

Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus were as clearly visible as at night. Green, gold, and scarlet colors splashed the horizon, adding to the grand spectacle. The corona of the sun was perfect.

TOTAL FOR 30 SECONDS

The shadow of the total eclipse stole across the snow-covered landscape, visible about two minutes before and after the totality.

The total eclipse lasted for about 30 seconds, as scientists had forecast.

A purple light gradually descended over the earth, forerunning the total darkness. There was a period of dark-purple and black-gray light, during which dancing waves of crescented lights wove a fantastic pattern on snow fields, roadways, and the sides of buildings.

SPECTACULAR FEATURE

Bailey's beads, dancing like drops of liquid topaz strung on a sparkling thread, hung in the sky for just a moment before the eclipse became total. As they flickered out the shadow bands flared forth weirdly, heralding the appearance of the awe-inspiring corona.

Then slowly the shadow bands appeared on the opposite side of the solar-lunar conjunction. Bailey's beads spread their ochre crescent again, a feature of the spectacular eclipse about which the forecasts of astronomers had said little.

ARMY AIRPLANE USED

MITCHEL FIELD, N. Y., January 24.—The first of the 35 Army airplanes from which observations of the eclipse will be made left Mitchel Field at 7.45 o'clock this morning, and the other planes followed in quick succession.

Conditions for observation from the air were almost perfect, the only clouds in the sky being a high bank off the southern tip of Long Island.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the poet laureate of Kansas yield? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Concerning the contribution just made by our distinguished colleague, the poet laureate of Kansas, relative to what men, women, and children were doing this morning, I call attention to the fact that even before the days of Lord Byron the Good Book speaks of "looking through a glass, darkly." [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For objects not hereinbefore named that may be deemed urgent, including the preparation or purchase of plans and specifications of vessels and the employment of such hull draftsmen in the field and office as may be necessary for the same; the reimbursement, under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, of officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies furnished for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities and to shipwrecked persons temporarily provided for by them, not to exceed a total of \$550; actual necessary expenses of officers of the field force temporarily ordered to the office in the District of Columbia for consultation with the director, and not exceeding \$1,000 for the expenses of the attendance of representatives of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who may be designated as delegates from the United States at the meetings of the International Research Council or of its branches, \$4,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania should note that "the hour having arrived"—

Mr. SHREVE. The House is anxious to complete this bill, Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman, I am sure, wants to keep his agreement.

Mr. SHREVE. Let us run until half past four.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay, commissioned officers: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers on sea duty and other duty, holding relative rank with officers of the Navy, including one director with relative rank of captain, two hydrographic and geodetic—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not finished reading the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk completes the reading of the paragraph I make the point of order that we have no quorum present.

Mr. SHREVE. Will not the gentleman from Texas withhold that and permit us to read about three more pages?

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman makes an agreement with us I think he should keep it. He made a gentleman's agreement with us to stop at 4.15.

Mr. SHREVE. I did make a gentleman's agreement with the gentleman but we also made another agreement.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not understand that. I do not think those of us who stay here all the time should be overworked.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

- H. R. 8235. An act for the relief of Aktieselskabet Marie di Giorgio, a Norwegian corporation of Christiania, Norway;
 S. 3073. An act for the relief of George A. Berry;
 S. 369. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;
 S. 698. An act for the relief of the Great Lakes Engineering Works;
 S. 1427. An act for the relief of Rosa L. Yarbrough;
 S. 831. An act for the relief of H. B. Stout;
 S. 1568. An act for the relief of certain officers in the United States Army;
 S. 1605. An act for the relief of Emma Kiener;
 S. 1894. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Kin-Dave*;
 S. 1976. An act for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American & Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., and the United States Lloyds;
 S. 2316. An act to allow credit in the accounts of A. W. Smith;
 S. 3416. An act to authorize the appointment of Thomas James Camp as a major of Infantry, Regular Army;
 S. 3505. An act for the relief of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.);
 S. 2526. An act providing for an allotment of land from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation, Okla., to James F. Rowell, an intermarried and enrolled member of the Kiowa Tribe;
 S. 3509. An act to change the time for the holding of terms of court in the eastern district of South Carolina;
 S. 2669. An act for the relief of J. R. King;
 S. 2689. An act for the relief of the First International Bank of Sweetgrass, Mont.;
 S. 2711. An act for the relief of the Pitt River Power Co.; and
 S. 2764. An act authorizing the President to order Leo P. Quinn before a retiring board for a rehearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board either confirm his discharge or place him on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his discharge.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PEAVEY, for 10 days, on account of important business.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAYS CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning a Pan American Highways Congress, to meet at Buenos Aires on May 22, 1925, in which the participation of the Government of the United States has been invited by the Government of the Argentine Republic. Accompanying the report are copies of letters from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture furnishing information regarding the congress and urging the importance of participation therein by the United States.

In view of the strength of these representations, and in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, I request of Congress legislation which will authorize an appropriation of \$15,000 for the expenses of delegates of the United States to the Pan American Congress of Highways, to meet at Buenos Aires on May 22, 1925.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
 Washington, January 24.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, presented a privileged report on House Resolution 414, requesting a conference

with the Senate on the amendments to the bill H. R. 518, which was referred to the House Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

818. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for the Commission on the Memorial to the Sacrifices and Services in the World War of the Women of the United States of America and its Insular Possessions, \$150,000 (H. Doc. No. 576); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

819. A letter from the vice chairman of the American Legion, transmitting report of finances of the American Legion for the 12 months ending December 31, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GARNER of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 325. A joint resolution extending the time during which certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries may be returned duty free; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3251. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania and fixing his salary; with amendments (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3392. An act to amend section 558 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNEEL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 414. A resolution to send H. R. 518 to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of George Penrod; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 11920) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 11921) to authorize the permanent appointment of any acting chaplain in the Navy to the temporary grade and rank in the Navy held by him during the World War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11922) providing for the sale and disposal of public lands within the area heretofore surveyed as Boulder Lake in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 11923) to relieve persons in the military service of the United States during the war emergency period from claims for overpayment at that time not involving fraud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11924) to relieve persons in the naval service of the United States during the war emergency period from claims for overpayment at that time not involving fraud; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MACLAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 11925) for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and United States Marine Corps Reserve who were erroneously released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than

their homes or places of enrollment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11926) to authorize the reimbursement of certain persons for the loss of personal effects at the naval training station, Hampton Roads, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 11927) to amend section 11 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, providing for the construction of primary or interstate highways in certain public-land States, and also amending paragraph 4, section 4, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," and prescribing limitations on the payment of Federal funds in the construction of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 11928) to promote and preserve the navigability of Cass Lake, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 11929) permitting the sale of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter section 5, township 6 north, range 15 west, 40 acres, in Conway County, Ark., to Ida Reece; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11930) directing the Director of the Bureau of the Census and Secretary of Agriculture, in the announcement and publication of cotton-production figures for any year for the United States and foreign countries, to include in the totals only actual weight of cotton ginned and baled; to the Committee on the Census.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, indorsing legislation for the Spanish Springs project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11931) granting a pension to John McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 11932) granting a pension to Sarah Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11933) granting an increase of pension to Delia M. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11934) granting a pension to Peter Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11935) for the relief of John R. Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11936) granting an increase of pension to Letitia D. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 11937) to carry out the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 11938) granting the distinguished-service cross to Richard M. Boyd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11939) granting an increase of pension to George T. Mahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11940) to correct the military record of Felix Sizemore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11941) granting a pension to William Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11942) to provide for the payment of amounts expended in the construction and maintenance of a hangar and flying field for the use of the Air Mail Service; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11943) granting a pension to Betsey Jane Hazen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11944) for the relief of John M. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 11945) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SITES: A bill (H. R. 11946) granting a pension to Louisa R. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11947) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to David A. Vincent certain lands in Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11948) granting a pension to Mary D. Foland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11949) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11950) granting a pension to Louis Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3551. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, urging the extension of the civil service law to presidential postmasters and to the entire prohibition enforcement bureau; also urging the strict observance of provision of the civil service law which prohibits congressional recommendations for appointments in the classified service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3552. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of George A. Newberry and other residents of Mayville, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3553. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of American Engineering Council, Washington, D. C.; also John E. Lloyd, president William M. Lloyd Co., Philadelphia, Pa., recommending adoption of appropriation of \$89,200 to be used by the Department of Commerce in the furtherance of utilization of forest products; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3554. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 121 residents of Red Bluff, Calif., protesting against the proposed compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3555. By Mr. MacLAFFERTY: Petition of citizens of Oakland, Calif., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) and other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3556. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of adult residents of Ottawa County, State of Michigan, against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) and any other religious legislation which may be pending before Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3557. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of the Hermosa Land & Cattle Co., Albuquerque, N. Mex., J. A. Wigmore, president, indorsing the Phipps bill (S. 2325); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3558. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Homer A. Dunn, of New York City, protesting against House Joint Resolution 315; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3559. By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: Petition of over 2,000 citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the same treatment of the Spanish-American War veterans as other veterans of other wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

3560. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Greater Boston Chapter of the General Alumni Association of Howard University, favoring the passage of House bill 9635; also Boston First Austrian Hungarian Association and Lazarus Davis Lodge, No. 548, I. O. B. A., favoring revision of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

MONDAY, January 26, 1925

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as the recipients of Thy mercy, we approach the throne of grace this morning. We bless Thee for all the kindnesses which Thou hast poured in upon us in our daily lives, and in all the varied responsibilities which come to us. We humbly beseech of Thee this morning to be in the thought and in the purpose of each one dealing with great obligations and meeting his various duties as in Thy sight and for Thy glory. Be very gracious, we beseech of Thee, and accept of us. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, January 22, 1925, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed